

**Feasibility Analysis of the National Scenic Byways Program and Other  
Travel Route Alternatives for Texas and a Summary of Outdoor  
Advertising and Roadside Vegetation Regulations in Texas**

**Prepared by the Center for Nature and Heritage Tourism**

**Department of Geography**

**Southwest Texas State University**

**San Marcos, Texas 78666**

**November, 2002**



## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1: Introduction	4
Chapter 2: Purposes and Operation of the National Scenic Byways Program	6
Chapter 3: Corridor Management Plans	16
Chapter 4: Analysis of Comparable Travel Routes	18
Chapter 5: Feasibility Analysis of a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program for Texas	37
Chapter 6: Assessment of the Feasibility of Alternatives to a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program	48
Chapter 7: Summary and Recommendations	53
Chapter 8: Summary of Texas Regulations Regarding Outdoor Advertising and Roadside Vegetation	54
Appendix 1: Grant Awards for 2002	62
Appendix 2: Designated National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads	68
Appendix 3: Survey Results	75
References	85

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Composition of the National Scenic Byway Advisory Committee	7
Table 2: Definitions of Specific Terms	8
Table 3: Designation Standards for National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads	10
Table 4: Designation Criteria	11
Table 5: Intrinsic Qualities	12
Table 6: Requirements for the Corridor Management Plan	13
Table 7: Summary of Economic Benefits of Heritage Tourism	19
Table 8: Economic Value of Historic Preservation in Texas	20
Table 9: Summary of Economic Benefits of Nature Tourism	22
Table 10: Benefits of Nature Tourism	23
Table 11: Benefits of Wine Tourism	24
Table 12: Tourism Attractions Associated with Wine Tourism in the Napa Valley	25
Table 13: Conservation and Preservation Awards to National Scenic Byways	29
Table 14: Eligible Activities for Scenic Byway Grants from the FHWA	42
Table 15: Designated or Themed Travel Routes in Texas	51

## **Executive Summary**

### **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility of Texas' participation in the National Scenic Byways Program, as sponsored and organized by the Federal Highway Administration and to evaluate Texas regulations regarding outdoor advertising and roadside vegetation. This study was authorized by Senate Bill 1128 of the 77<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session pursuant to the Scenic Byways Program under Section 391.256 of the Transportation Code.

### **National Scenic Byways Program**

The National Scenic Byways Program was established as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1989 (ISTEA) and was continued under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). Its purposes are to facilitate conservation of intrinsic landscape qualities, stimulate local economic development through tourism, and to regulate outdoor advertising.

The Program sets out to achieve its purposes through use of a required corridor management plan for each byway, various forms of technical assistance provided by the National Scenic Byways Organization, and through prohibition of new outdoor advertising on designated scenic byways. The organization and policies of the National Scenic Byway Program were published as a "Notice of FHWA interim policy" in the *Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995. However, that interim policy statement was never formalized, so the regulatory aspects of the program have never been authorized.

### **Analysis**

This study analyzes the economics, conservation, and regional/community identity performance of several travel route programs including:

- Texas Heritage Trails

- Texas Parks and Wildlife Trails

- Wine Routes in the United States, Canada, and Europe

- National Scenic Byways nationwide

The study also includes an analysis of Scenic Byway programs in Texas' neighbor states (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) and in other southwestern states that offer similar attractions as Texas (Arizona, Colorado, and Utah). This analysis focuses on the purposes, characteristics, and operation of those byway programs.

The study then analyzes the feasibility of conservation/preservation and economic stimulus functions of the National Scenic Byways Program goals in the context of the State of Texas. The analysis is based on examinations of the strengths and opportunities, weaknesses and threats of each of the program goals.

**Conclusions  
regarding a state-  
wide National  
Scenic Byways  
Program**

Regarding the feasibility of a state-wide National Scenic Byway program, this study concludes that although a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program would offer some potential benefits in terms of landscape preservation and economic development assistance, such a program would face two difficult problems in Texas.

1. There is currently no legal mechanism in Texas rural areas to develop, implement, or enforce the required Corridor Management Plan. Land use regulation is highly controversial and contentious in Texas. Rural elected officials are unwilling to introduce such an unpopular issue, especially motivated by something as controversial as a federally-backed tourism program.
2. Rural tourism can provide economic benefits to communities. However, benefits to landowners are less clear, even though they must bear the costs of owning and maintaining the resources that would be directly affected by the Corridor Management Plan. Landowners also may receive the greatest negative impacts from tourism.

**Alternatives to a  
state-wide  
National Scenic  
Byways Program**

The study then assesses the feasibility of four alternatives to a state-wide National Scenic Byway program. Those alternatives are (1) no action, (2) a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on public lands, (3) a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on which all landowners agree to a transfer of development rights to an agency or organization that can develop, implement, and enforce a Corridor Management Plan, and (4) a clearinghouse to coordinate and promote existing scenic and thematic roads in Texas.

## **Recommendations**

Considering all of the alternatives, this report supports the following recommendations:

1. The State of Texas should consider adoption of a National Scenic Byways Program, limited to roads that pass through public land. This would allow the state to take advantage of the marketing efforts of the National Scenic Byways Program. All of the State's travel routes would be included on the National Scenic Byways web site. However, this action would avoid the potential problems associated with establishing a National Scenic Byways Program on roads that pass through private land.
2. A state agency, probably the Texas Department of Transportation Travel Division, should be funded to operate a clearinghouse of travel routes in Texas and to explore ways to develop a means of cooperation that would be beneficial to the various sponsors of travel routes, to local residents, and to the traveling public. This would provide the visitor with a cohesive and comprehensive "package" and would facilitate tourism product development across the state, especially in rural areas.

## **Outdoor advertising regulations**

Current Texas regulations of outdoor advertising signs do not provide the level of protection afforded by the National Scenic Byways Program. Recognizing the vulnerability of certain scenic roads to the intrusion of outdoor advertising signs, recent legislation [77(R) SB 1128] prohibits new off-premise signs and places restrictions on reconstruction or relocation of existing off-premise signs on specified road segments in the state. This legislation is stronger than the regulations of the National Scenic Byways Program because actual civil penalties are imposed in the case of violation. The only negative sanction of the National Scenic Byways Program is to de-designate the byway, thus leaving enforcement of the regulation up to unspecified local processes that may or may not be effective.

# **Chapter 1**

## **Introduction**

### **Authorization and Purposes of the Study**

This study was authorized by the Texas Department of Transportation, in response to C.S.S.B. 1129, and conducted by the Center for Nature and Heritage Tourism, Department of Geography, Southwest Texas State University. The purposes of the study were:

1. To assess the feasibility of participation in the National Scenic Byways Program by the State of Texas.
2. To identify and assess alternatives to a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program.
3. To analyze current regulations in Texas to control outdoor advertising on public roads and roadside vegetation.

### **Scope of the Study**

This study provides information to help answer the following questions:

1. What are the strengths/opportunities and weaknesses/threats of a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program for the State of Texas?
2. What are the alternatives to a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program for Texas and what are the strengths/opportunities and weaknesses/threats of those alternatives?
3. What is the current status of State legislation and regulations regarding outdoor advertising and roadside vegetation?

### **Methods**

Several methods were used to answer these questions. A comprehensive and in-depth review was made of the literature on scenic byways, nature and heritage tourism, tourism as economic development, impacts of tourism, rural tourism, rural economic development, agricultural restructuring, and private property rights related to tourism. A survey was conducted of administrators of 76 scenic byways. Byways were selected for the survey if their byway program involved substantial amounts of private property. Scenic byways programs were analyzed in Texas' neighbor states (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) and in other southwestern states that share Texas' market niche (Arizona, Colorado, and Utah).

This study focused on rural tourism and included private property concerns because those two issues are fundamental



to the idea of a scenic byways program in Texas. There are a few urban scenic byways, and Alaska has one that is based on ferry routes. However, by far the most common expression of scenic byways is in rural areas, which in Texas also implies private property. Private property issues are fundamental to assessing the feasibility of a National Scenic Byway Program because the authorizing legislation for the program contains specific provisions for a Corridor Management Plan that is intended to protect the scenic, natural, historic, cultural, archeological, and recreational qualities of the byway, with the implication of land use regulation.

## **Organization of the Report**

This remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2: Purposes and Operation of the National Scenic Byways Program
- Chapter 3: Corridor Management Plans
- Chapter 4: Analysis of Comparable Travel Routes
- Chapter 5: Feasibility Analysis of a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program for Texas
- Chapter 6: Assessment of the Feasibility of Alternatives to a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program
- Chapter 7: Summary and Recommendations
- Chapter 8: Summary of Texas Regulations Regarding Outdoor Advertising and Roadside Vegetation
- Appendix 1: Grant Awards for 2002
- Appendix 2: Designated National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads
- Appendix 3: Survey Results
- References

## **Chapter 2**

### **Purposes and Operation of the National Scenic Byways Program**

#### **Origin of the National Scenic Byways Program**

It has long been recognized that roads can serve as scenic features and tourist attractions. Wine tour trails have been used in Europe for almost 150 years (Hall and Macionis 1998). The Autumn Trails Tour was established in Wood County, Texas, in 1959 “to gain recognition for the fall beauty of the area” (*The Winnsboro News*, 2002.) The Federal Highway Administration authorized studies in 1966 to assess the feasibility of a national scenic byways program. The State of Texas established its ten travel trails in 1967.

The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) authorized the formation of a National Scenic Byways Program and that program has been continued under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). To date, thirty-nine states in the U.S. have established a total of 136 themed routes that have been designated as National Scenic Byways or All American Roads by the Federal Highway Administration. In addition, most states have established travel routes that have not been officially designated as National Scenic Byways.

The *Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995, sets out the structure and intended regulations of the National Scenic Byways Program in a “Notice of FHWA interim policy.” This interim policy was never formalized to actually develop regulations. Thus, the National Scenic Byway Program operates as a “recommended” program rather than a “regulatory” program (Hanka 2002). This is important because the interim policy contains specific statements of criteria and requirements that make the program appear to be regulatory, but the actual implementation and operation of the program is non-regulatory. The full text of the “Notice of interim policy” is available at <http://www.byways.org/grants/docs/FedReg.pdf>

#### **Purposes of the National Scenic Byways Program**

The “Notice of interim policy” does not clearly state a purpose for the scenic byway program, other than to include by reference the provisions of a 1991 study that “...included recommendations for establishing a national scenic byways program, including recommended techniques for maintaining and enhancing the scenic, recreational, and historic qualities associated with each byway” (*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995). Two primary purposes were implied in the National

Scenic Byways Program: (1) to maintain the intrinsic qualities of byways and (2) to stimulate local economic development through tourism. The program also has the purpose of controlling or eliminating outdoor advertising on byways. As it evolved, the National Scenic Byways Program identified eight goals:

1. Expand public awareness and understanding of scope and impact of the National Scenic Byways Program.
2. Continuously improve the quality of byways in the National Scenic Byways Program.
3. Provide high quality visitor experience.
4. Strengthen, diversify and expand partnerships.
5. Foster and strengthen local economies and other local community goals.
6. Foster State and local leadership in implementing the National Scenic Byways Program.
7. Expand the pool of high quality projects.
8. Develop and use best tools for managing intrinsic qualities.

[http://www.byways.org/community/program/program\\_info.html](http://www.byways.org/community/program/program_info.html)

**Lack of rural representation**

The formation of the National Scenic Byways Program was shaped by an advisory committee of seventeen members representing a variety of organizations and interests (See Table 1).

Table 1: Composition of the National Scenic Byways Advisory Committee
Federal Highway Administration U. S. Forest Service National Park Service Bureau of Land Management Bureau of Indian Affairs U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration of the Department of Commerce recreational users of scenic byways conservationists the tourism industry

**Table 1, continued**

historic preservationists  
highway users  
State and local highway and transportation officials  
the motoring public  
scenic preservationists  
the outdoor advertising industry  
the planning professions

(*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)

It is significant that neither agriculture, forestry, nor other industries that derive their income from productive activities on the land, nor organizations that represent landowners were included in the advisory group. The National Scenic Byways Program is part of the larger farmland/rural conservation movement that began in the early 1970s and has expressed urban values, but has consistently failed to involve rural people or businesses in its policy and program formulation (Bunce 1998).

The following are selected excerpts from the interim policy under which the federal National Scenic Byways Program operates.

**Definitions**

The following definitions are essential to assess the feasibility of the National Scenic Byways Program.

**Table 2: Definitions of Specific Terms**

- a. *Corridor* means the road or highway right-of-way and the adjacent area that is visible from and extending along the highway. The distance the corridor extends from the highway could vary with the different intrinsic qualities.
- b. *Corridor Management Plan* means a written document that specifies the actions, procedures, controls, operational practices, and administrative strategies to maintain the scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, and natural qualities of the scenic byway.
- c. *Federal Agency* means the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and their scenic byways programs.

**Table 2, continued**

- d. *Federal Agency Scenic Byway* means a road or highway located on lands under Federal ownership which has been officially designated by the responsible Federal agency as a scenic byway for its scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, or natural qualities.
- e. *Intrinsic Quality* means scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, or natural features that are considered representative, unique, irreplaceable, or distinctly characteristic of an area.
- f. *Local Commitment* means assurance provided by communities along the scenic byway that they will undertake actions, such as zoning and other protective measures, to preserve the scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, and natural integrity of the scenic byway and the adjacent area as identified in the corridor management plan.
- g. *Regional Significance* means characteristics that are representative of a geographic area encompassing two or more States.
- h. *Scenic Byways Agency* means the Board, Commission, Bureau, Department, Office, etc., that has the responsibility for administering the State's scenic byways program activities. Unless otherwise designated, FHWA will assume that the State Scenic Byways Agency is the State Department of Transportation or State highway agency as recognized in the administration of title 23, United States Code.
- i. *Scenic Byway* means a public road having special scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, and/or natural qualities that have been recognized as such through legislation or some other official declaration. The terms "road" and "highway" are synonymous. They are not meant to define higher or lower functional classifications or wider or narrower cross-sections. Moreover, the terms State Scenic Byway, National Scenic Byway, or All-American Road refer not only to the road or highway itself but also to the corridor through which it passes.
- j. *State Scenic Byway* means a road or highway under State, Federal, or local ownership that has been designated by the State through legislation or some other official declaration for its scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, or natural qualities. An Official Declaration is an action taken by a Governor or that of an individual, board, committee, or political subdivision acting with granted authority on behalf of the State. (*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)

## Standards

For a road to be designated as a National Scenic Byway or All-American Road it must meet eight standards, as defined in Table 3.

**Table 3: Designation Standards for National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads**

- a. Any highway or road submitted for designation under the National Scenic Byways Program by State or Federal agencies should be designated as a State scenic byway. However, roads that meet all criteria and requirements for National designation but not State or Federal agencies' designation criteria may be considered for national designation on a case-by-case basis. Any road nominated for the National Scenic Byway or All-American Road designation will be considered to be a designated State scenic byway.
- b. A road or highway must safely and conveniently accommodate two-wheel-drive automobiles with standard clearances to be considered for designation as a National Scenic Byway or an All-American Road.
- c. Roads or highways considered for National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads designations should accommodate, wherever feasible, bicycle and pedestrian travel.
- d. To be considered for the All-American Roads designation, roads or highways should safely accommodate conventional tour buses.
- e. A scenic byways corridor management plan, prepared in accordance with Paragraph 9 of this policy, must be submitted in order for any road or highway to be considered for the National Scenic Byway or All-American Road designation.
- f. For All-American Roads, there must be a demonstration of the extent to which enforcement mechanisms are being implemented by communities along the highway in accordance with the corridor management plan.
- g. Before a road or highway is nominated for designation as an All-American Road, user facilities (e.g. overlooks, food services, etc.) should be available for travelers.
- h. An important criteria for both National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads is continuity. Neither should have too many gaps but rather should be as continuous as possible and should minimize intrusions on the visitor's experience. (*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)

**Designation criteria**

The Federal Highway Administration has specified the procedure by which a route becomes designated as a National Scenic Byway or an All American Road.

**Table 4: Designation Criteria****a. National Scenic Byways Criteria**

To be designated as a National Scenic Byway, a road or highway must significantly meet at least one of the six scenic byways intrinsic qualities discussed below.

The characteristics associated with the intrinsic qualities are those that are distinct and most representative of the region. The significance of the features contributing to the distinctive characteristics of the corridor's intrinsic quality are recognized throughout the region.

**b. All-American Road Criteria**

In order to be designated as an All-American Road, the road or highway must meet the criteria for at least two of the intrinsic qualities. The road or highway must also be considered a destination unto itself. To be recognized as such, it must provide an exceptional traveling experience that is so recognized by travelers that they would make a drive along the highway a primary reason for their trip.

The characteristics associated with the intrinsic qualities are those which best represent the nation and which may contain one-of-a-kind features that do not exist elsewhere. The significance of the features contributing to the distinctive characteristics of the corridor's intrinsic quality are recognized nationally.

*(Federal Register Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)*

**Intrinsic qualities**

A route must provide special features to be designated as a National Scenic Byway or an All American Road. The regulations define six "intrinsic qualities" that can qualify a road for designation (Table 5).

**Table 5: Intrinsic Qualities**

- a. Scenic Quality is the heightened visual experience derived from the view of natural and manmade elements of the visual environment of the scenic byway corridor. The characteristics of the landscape are strikingly distinct and offer a pleasing and most memorable visual experience. All elements of the landscape—landform, water, vegetation, and manmade development—contribute to the quality of the corridor’s visual environment. Everything present is in harmony and shares in the intrinsic qualities.
- b. Natural Quality applies to those features in the visual environment that are in a relatively undisturbed state. These features predate the arrival of human populations and may include geological formations, fossils, landform, water bodies, vegetation, and wildlife. There may be evidence of human activity, but the natural features reveal minimal disturbances.
- c. Historic Quality encompasses legacies of the past that are distinctly associated with physical elements of the landscape, whether natural or manmade, that are of such historic significance that they educate the viewer and stir an appreciation for the past. The historic elements reflect the actions of people and may include buildings, settlement patterns, and other examples of human activity. Historic features can be inventoried, mapped, and interpreted. They possess integrity of location, design, setting, material, workmanship, feeling, and association.
- d. Cultural Quality is evidence and expressions of the customs or traditions of a distinct group of people. Cultural features including, but not limited to, crafts, music, dance, rituals, festivals, speech, food, special events, vernacular architecture, etc., are currently practiced. The cultural qualities of the corridor could highlight one or more significant communities and/or ethnic traditions.
- e. Archeological Quality involves those characteristics of the scenic byways corridor that are physical evidence of historic or prehistoric human life or activity that are visible and capable of being inventoried and interpreted. The scenic byway corridor’s archeological interest, as identified through ruins, artifacts, structural remains, and other physical evidence have scientific significance that educate the viewer and stir an appreciation for the past.
- f. Recreational Quality involves outdoor recreational activities directly association with and dependent upon the natural and cultural elements of the corridor’s landscape. The recreational activities provide opportunities for active and passive recreational experiences. They include, but are not limited to, downhill skiing, rafting, boating, fishing, and hiking. Driving the road itself may qualify as a pleasurable recreational experience. The recreational activities may be seasonal, but the quality and importance of the recreational activities as seasonal operations must be well recognized. (*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)



**Means to achieve  
purposes**

The purposes of the National Scenic Byways Program are to conserve and enhance the quality of a road's intrinsic qualities, to limit outdoor advertising on the road, and to facilitate tourism. The program accomplishes these purposes through (1) the requirement for a detailed Corridor Management Plan that outlines how the intrinsic qualities will be maintained and interpreted for the visitors (Table 6), and (2) the right to de-designate a National Scenic Byway or an All American Road that fails to carry out its Corridor Management Plan. To this date, the Federal Highway Administration has not initiated de-designation of any approved byways as a sanction for failure to perform (Hanka 2002). However, some counties in Illinois have successfully sought de-designation (Adams 2002).

Requirements for the Corridor Management Plan are as follows:

**Table 6: Requirements for the Corridor Management Plan**

- a. A corridor management plan, developed with community involvement, must be prepared for the scenic byway corridor proposed for national designation. It should provide for the conservation and enhancement of the byway's intrinsic qualities as well as the promotion of tourism and economic development. The plan should provide an effective management strategy to balance these concerns while providing for the users' enjoyment of the byway. The corridor management plan is very important to the designation process, as it provides an understanding of how a road or highway possesses characteristics vital for designation as a National Scenic Byway or an All-American Road. The corridor management plan must include at least the following:
  - (1) A map identifying the corridor boundaries and the location of intrinsic qualities and different land uses within the corridor.
  - (2) An assessment of such intrinsic qualities and of their context.
  - (3) A strategy for maintaining and enhancing those intrinsic qualities. The level of protection for different parts of a National Scenic Byway or All-American Road can vary, with the highest level of protection afforded those parts which most reflect their intrinsic values. All nationally recognized scenic byways should, however, be maintained with particularly high standards, not only for travelers' safety and comfort, but also for preserving the highest levels of visual integrity and attractiveness.
  - (4) A schedule and a listing of all agency, group, and individual responsibilities in the implementation of the corridor management plan, and a description of enforcement and review mechanisms, including a schedule for the continuing review of how well those responsibilities are being met.

**Table 6: continued**

- (5) A strategy describing how existing development might be enhanced and new development might be accommodated while still preserving the intrinsic qualities of the corridor. This can be done through design review, and such land management techniques as zoning, easements, and economic incentives.
- (6) A plan to assure on-going public participation in the implementation of corridor management objectives.
- (7) A general review of the road's or highway's safety and accident record to identify any correctable faults in highway design, maintenance, or operation.
- (8) A plan to accommodate commerce while maintaining a safe and efficient level of highway service, including convenient user facilities.
- (9) A demonstration that intrusions on the visitor experience have been minimized to the extent feasible, and a plan for making improvements to enhance that experience.
- (10) A demonstration of compliance with all existing local, State, and Federal laws on the control of outdoor advertising.
- (11) A signage plan that demonstrates how the State will insure and make the number and placement of signs more supportive of the visitor experience.
- (12) A narrative describing how the National Scenic Byway will be positioned for marketing.
- (13) A discussion of design standards relating to any proposed modification of the roadway. This discussion should include an evaluation of how the proposed changes may affect on the intrinsic qualities of the byway corridor.
- (14) A description of plans to interpret the significant resources of the scenic byway.
- b. In addition to the information identified in Paragraph 9a above, corridor management plans for All-American Roads must include:
  - (1) A narrative on how the All-American Road would be promoted, interpreted, and marketed in order to attract travelers, especially those from other countries. The agencies responsible for these activities should be identified.
  - (2) A plan to encourage the accommodation of increased tourism, if this is projected. Some demonstration that the roadway, lodging and dining facilities, roadside rest areas, and other tourist necessities will be adequate for the number of visitors induced by the byway's designation as an All-American Road.
  - (3) A plan for addressing multi-lingual information needs. Further, there must be a demonstration of the extent to which enforcement mechanisms are being implemented in accordance with the corridor management plan.

*(Federal Register Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)*

## **Prohibition of Outdoor Advertising**

It is fundamental to the assumptions of the National Scenic Byway Program that billboards are not consistent with the conservation and enhancement of the six intrinsic qualities by which a National Scenic Byway or an All American Road are designated. Thus, the “Notice of interim policy” contains the following statement regarding outdoor advertising.

*As provided at 23 U.S.C. 131(s), if a State has a State scenic byway program, the State may not allow the erection of new signs not in conformance with 23 U.S.C. 131© along any highway on the Interstate System or Federal-aid primary system which before, on, or after December 18, 1991, has been designated as a scenic byway under the State’s scenic byway program. This prohibition would also apply to Interstate System and Federal-aid primary system highways that are designated scenic byways under the National Scenic Byways Program and All-American Roads Program, whether or not they are designated as State scenic byways.  
(Federal Register Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)*

## **Chapter 3**

### **Corridor Management Plans**

#### **Regulatory implications and ambiguity of the Corridor Management Plan**

The requirement for a Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is the most controversial aspect of the National Scenic Byways Program because it implies widespread land use control and other means to protect the Byway's scenic, natural, historic, cultural, archeological, and recreational intrinsic qualities. Effective protection of those qualities would require a complex process of setting goals, determining implementation strategies, and establishing enforcement mechanisms. Effective protection of such a wide range of factors is rarely achieved and remains controversial even on federal lands such as National Parks and National Forests. It would be a tall order indeed to implement such a level of resource protection in a rural area where people live and make their living on privately owned land.

In practice, the requirement for a Corridor Management Plan has not been as onerous as it appears. First, as noted in Chapter 2, the National Scenic Byways Program was never formalized into law, and therefore has no regulatory authority. In evaluating proposals for a new byway, the Federal Highway Administration's external review team examines the proposed Corridor Management Plan and judges whether or not it appears to be a good faith attempt to protect the byway's intrinsic qualities. However, the emphasis of the evaluation is on the tourism development and interpretive potential of the plan (Adams 2002).

The resource protection portions of Corridor Management Plans from Minnesota and New Mexico offer good examples of CMPs that have been approved by the FHWA. The Minnesota CMP recommends design standards and planning guidelines, but emphasizes that the plan "will serve in a facilitative, supportive and promotional role, not a regulatory role" (Minnesota River Valley Scenic Byway Alliance 2001, 5-6). The plan identifies eight "actions:" (1) Identify Threatened Resources, (2) Recognize Well-Managed Change, (3) Encourage the Adoption of Design Guidelines for New Development within the Corridor, (4) Encourage Well-Planned Roadway Modifications, (5) Support Local Agriculture, (6) Develop and Invest in Regional Recreation Amenities such (sic) a Regional Trail System, (7) Coordinate with Environmental Management Programs, and (8) Support a Healthy Valley Rural Culture by Promoting Local Cultural

Organizations and Events (Minnesota River Valley Scenic Byway Alliance 2001, 5-6 – 5-9).

In New Mexico, the Route 66 Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan lists management “tools” recommended by the National Park Service, including: “local land use controls, acquisition of sites through purchase from willing sellers, donations, easements acquisition, support of partners in protection efforts, advocacy to protect resources when government decisions are involved, and developing voluntary certification agreements with cooperating owners/managers” (Gutierrez 2000, 28). However, the CMP contains no statements about the implementation or enforcement of these tools. The New Mexico Turquoise Trail Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan emphasizes transfer of development rights. It also relies on county land use regulations.

*Currently the counties who have jurisdiction over the Turquoise Trail area all have zoning regulations in place. Much of the area is zoned agricultural and residential. Residential is restricted in that no multi-family housing is allowed and each house must be on a minimum of two acres. In certain areas, commercial and neighborhood shopping areas are allowed.*  
(Turquoise Trail All American Road Project 2002)

#### **Potential for land use regulation**

Because of its perception and potential, prudent landowners will probably continue to be concerned about the implication of land use control in the requirements for Corridor Management Plans. Landowners perceive a threat in a federal program that implies “zoning and land use control” on “the road or highway right-of-way and the adjacent area that is visible from and extending along the highway” (*Federal Register* Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995). And even though the National Scenic Byways Program operates under an “interim policy,” there is the potential that the program could be finalized, including land use regulations.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Analysis of Comparable Travel Routes**

#### **Comparables analysis**

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the performance of travel route programs that provide useful information to help assess the feasibility of a National Scenic Byways Program or other alternatives for Texas. The performance analysis is based on the following criteria: economics, conservation, and regional/community identity. The travel route programs analyzed in this chapter are the following:

- Texas Heritage Trails
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Trails
- Wine Routes in the United States, Canada, and Europe
- National Scenic Byways nationwide

This chapter also includes an analysis of Scenic Byway Programs in Texas' neighbor states (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) and in other southwestern states that offer similar attractions as Texas (Arizona, Colorado, and Utah). This analysis focuses on the purposes, characteristics, and operation of those byway programs.

#### **Texas Heritage Trails**

The Texas Historical Commission, in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation, has established a program to develop heritage tourism along the ten Texas Travel Trails that were established by Governor John Connally in 1967. Because the trails are long, the Historical Commission has used them as a means to give identity to entire regions, not just to the trail route. The Commission provides financial support for a limited time period and ongoing technical and promotional support. A professional trail coordinator is assigned to the region to assist in developing appropriate visitor attractions and to help build a local organization that will generate financial support after the Commission's support terminates (Headrick 2002).

To date three heritage trails have been formalized: Forest Trail, Forts Trail, and Independence Trail. The Historical Commission is currently working with other trail regions to formalize organizations based on the remaining seven trails (Headrick 2002).

## **Economic impacts**

The Historical Commission has not analyzed economic benefits of the individual heritage trails, but it has analyzed the economic benefits of heritage tourism in general, which the trails are intended to promote and facilitate. The findings of their analysis, published in 1999 are summarized below in Table 7.

**Table 7: Summary of Economic Benefits of Heritage Tourism**

- Eleven percent of travelers to Texas were attracted by the state's heritage.
- Heritage travelers in Texas spent \$1.43 billion annually.
- Heritage travel expenditures supported 32,000 jobs in all sectors of the Texas economy.
- Heritage travelers spent an average of \$114 per day, compared to \$85 per day for non-heritage travelers.
- Heritage travel day-trippers spent \$194 per day, compared to \$71 per day for non-heritage day-trippers.
- More heritage travelers in Texas pay for lodging than non-heritage travelers.
- Heritage travelers stay an average of 3.2 nights, compared to 2.7 nights for non-heritage travelers. More heritage travelers stay four nights or more (32 percent), as compared to non-heritage travelers (23 percent).
- For each \$1 million spent by heritage travelers in Texas:
  - 22 jobs are created
  - \$480,000 in income is created
  - \$49,000 in state taxes are generated
  - \$43,000 in local taxes are generated
  - the Gross State Product increases by \$825,000

(The Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University, Texas Perspectives, and the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, 1999)

## **Conservation and preservation**

Heritage tourism, and the Texas Travel Trail program by assumption, stimulate historic preservation and conservation because heritage travelers create a demand for preserved and restored sites. The demand for historic sites also generates economic benefits. Conclusions regarding the value of historic preservation in Texas are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8: Economic Value of Historic Preservation in Texas**

- Historical designations improve property values.
- Incentives for historic properties attract reinvestment.
- Historic building rehabilitation rebuilds Texas communities.
- Preservation of historic properties creates jobs.
- Texas' heritage attracts tourists.
- History museums draw tourists and economic vitality to communities.
- Revitalization of Texas Main Street cities makes good business sense.

(The Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University, Texas Perspectives, and the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, 1999)

To reemphasize, the benefits described above are related to heritage tourism in general, not to a specific trail or set of trails. However, because the trails serve as attractions, it seems fair to assume that they are instrumental in achieving the economic and preservation benefits described above.

**Regional/community  
identity**

The Texas Travel Trails Program appears to have a positive effect on regional/community identity. The Forts Trail, the first trail organized under the THC program, has helped establish connections between individuals, organizations, and businesses. It has also helped the region become more visible as a travel destination (Richards 2002). The Texas Travel Trails are probably limited in their ability to generate regional/community identity due to their large size. For example, the Forts Trail extends from Mason and Eldorado to Throckmorton and Jacksboro, including fifty-two communities. The Forest Trail Region includes the eastern part of Texas from the Red River to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Trinity River to Texas' eastern border, embracing forty-nine communities. Establishing effective coordination in such large regions has been difficult (Meador 2002).



## **Texas Parks and Wildlife Trails**

### **Great Texas Coastal Birding Trail**

A leader in nature tourism and the number one destination for birdwatchers in the United States, Texas completed the last segment of The Great Texas Coastal Birding Trail (GTCBT) in 2000. The first birding trail in the country, as well as the first wildlife viewing *driving* trail, it was developed, and is sponsored, by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT). Federal Highway Administration Enhancement Funds, through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act provided the financial support together with the 20 percent match required of local communities (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002). Local caretakers are selected by TPWD to assist in preserving the wildlife and natural areas.

Covering the entire Texas coastal region, the GTBCT travels through 41 counties, and features 308 distinct wildlife-viewing sites. The GTCBT was developed to assist birders in spotting the 487 species of birds found along the Texas coast, out of 620 species found statewide, more than in any other state. The premier birding experience, the GTCBT was a winner in the prestigious British Airways Tourism for Tomorrow Awards (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002a).

### **Additional driving trails**

Due to the success of the GTCBT, which exceeded all expectations, TPWD has received funding to develop similar wildlife viewing driving trails in Texas, the Great Texas Nature Trails. Modeled on the GTCBT, these trails are being developed on roads that pass through both public and private lands. Upon completion, there will be trails in each of five major regions of Texas. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department is developing this system of trails with the support of private citizens, conservation groups, local landowners and land managers, businesses, government agencies, and communities. The Heart of Texas and High Plains Wildlife Trails are scheduled to open in late 2002 or early 2003, and the Prairies and Pineywoods Trail is scheduled to open in 2004 (Campbell 2002).

### **Economic impacts**

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department commissioned a survey in 1999 to analyze the economic benefits of the GTCBT. The findings of this study are summarized in Table 9. According to the report prepared by Eubanks and Stoll (1999), visitors to the GTCBT spent an average of 31.23 days per year birding on the GTCBT with an average expenditure

of \$78.52 per day. Also surveyed were visitors birding in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) of south Texas. Here the average visitor spent 11.5 days per year in the region and spent an average of \$117.64 per day. According to the Texas Department of Economic Development, in 1999 birders visiting Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge (in the Rio Grande Valley) alone spent \$36.5 million on food, gas, lodging, and other services (Texas Department of Economic Development 2000).

Coastal communities and local landowners which sponsor the GTCBT have championed the Trail, and, in turn, have enjoyed favorable economic benefits through increased visitor use of lodging establishments, restaurants, campgrounds, gift shops, gas stations, etc. Nature-based tourism has become an important part of the local economy in many of these communities.

Additionally, the Great Texas Birding Classic, a contest to identify bird species held annually along the GTCBT, involves many of the coastal communities as host cities and/or sponsors. This works to enhance the regional identity of the area while serving to add to the local economic base by attracting more tourists. Further, as this event has grown over the years, large corporations are becoming sponsors. These include: Southwest Airlines, Phillips Petroleum, Anheuser-Busch, Pentax and Leica Camera.

**Table 9: Summary of Economic Benefits of Nature Tourism**

- Visitors to the GTCBT spent an average of \$2,452.18 per year per person in the local communities.
- Visitors to the LRGV spent an average of \$1,352.86 per year per person in the local communities.
- Birding added \$90 million to Rio Grande Valley economy in 1998, 75% of the tourists were from out of state.
- Every \$78,085 spent in 2000 supported one job in Texas.
- 70 million Americans went birding in 1999, most came to Texas.

(Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002a)

## Conservation and preservation

Conservation and preservation of natural habitat is inherent in the GTCBT and the Great Texas Trails, and is further enhanced by the participation of local landowners and communities. Fifty-nine percent of the state's total land area consists of rangelands under private ownership. These landowners need ways to diversify their ranch incomes. Participating in nature-tourism activities provides additional income, promotes conservation and preservation of natural habitats increasing the value of natural areas (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002a). Both the GTCBT and the Great Texas Trails provide outdoor recreational opportunities for the public, contribute to diversifying agricultural economies, promote conservation of habitat by providing economic incentives for landowners and communities, and helps in maintaining rural lifestyles (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002a).

**Table 10: Benefits of Nature Tourism**

- Increases the number of nature travelers to Texas.
- Leads to increased conservation of habitats.
- Provides the opportunity for private landowners to meet the demand for public use for a fee.
- Offers economic incentives for communities.
- Increases awareness of Texas wildlife and habitats.
- Provides additional economic opportunities for farmers and ranchers.

(Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002a)

## Regional/ community identity

There have been no studies to analyze the effect of the GTCBT on regional/community identity. However, it is reasonable to assume a positive effect on the communities adjacent to and those sponsoring the Trail in that they are all a part of "the coastal trail." Also, based on the success of the Great Texas Birding Classic, it would appear there is a sense of regional identity.

## Wine Routes

Wine tourism is defined as "visitation to vineyards, wineries, wine festivals and wine shows for which grape wine tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of a grape wine region are the prime motivating factors for visitors (Hall and Macionis 1998: 197). Wine routes are included in this study because

they provide an important means of marketing and sales in wine regions.

The intrinsic qualities of wine regions can be particularly outstanding and a successful viticulture landscape combines agriculture, industry, and tourism (Peters 1997). Wine tourism is particularly relevant to the assessment of feasibility of a National Scenic Byways Program or alternatives in Texas because Texas has an active and growing wine industry. Seven wine trails have already been established in Texas (Table 15). Establishing higher visibility for these trails and for the wine regions they represent could provide a substantial benefit to the Texas wine industry.

### **Economic impacts**

The benefits of wine tourism have been recognized in Europe for almost 150 years. In Germany the *weinlehrpfad* (instructional wine path) provides information about German wines, leading to increased sales (Hall and Macionis 1998). The benefits of wine tourism as identified by the Italian Wine Tourism Association are shown in Table 11.

**Table 11: Benefits of Wine Tourism**

- It increases chances of economic development, product diversification and new occupational levels in the wine areas;
- It helps teach people how to discover the right wine. It deepens the knowledge of wine, and allows the understanding of the different flavours and perfumes;
- It increases the image and the reputation of Italian wines, especially for the high quality ones;
- It increases the commercial capabilities of wine cellars both in direct sales and through ordinary distribution channels;
- It promotes rural areas as a unique mixture of environmental, cultural and productive components, and contributes to the discovery and protection of the ancient traditions of rural villages; and
- It suggests new tourist destinations adding value to landscapes, foods, art of the Italian wine counties, creating a good opportunity to meet people of these areas. (Movimento del Turismo del Vino 1995, as quoted in Hall and Macionis 1998: 201)

In the United States, California has had the most visible success in combining wine production and tourism. Table 12 illustrates how the attraction of wineries has spread to a large variety of economic activities including weddings, meetings, ag-eco tourism, lodging, and real estate.

**Table 12: Tourism Attractions Associated with Wine Tourism in the Napa Valley**  
<http://www.napavalley.com/napavalley/mwinerie.html/>

**Napa Valley Site Index**

- **Event Planning Home Page**
  - Weddings
  - Meetings
- **Lodging Home Page**
  - Lodging By Region
  - Lodging By Type
    - Inns and Bed & Breakfasts
    - Hotels/Motels/Lodges
    - Spa and Resorts
    - Camping and RVs
    - Vacation and Property Rentals
    - Reservation Services
- **Real Estate Home Page**
  - By Region
  - By Service/Type Broker/Brokerage
  - Individual Agents
- **Things To Do Home Page**
  - Wineries
  - Dining
  - Tours / Sightseeing
  - Spas / Day Spas
  - Gourmet Sampling
  - Golf
  - Recreational Sports
  - Attractions
  - Ballooning & Skydiving
  - Ag-Eco Tourism
  - Parks and Beaches
  - The Arts
  - Shopping
- **Wineries**
  - Featured Napa Valley Wineries
  - Calistoga
  - St. Helena - Deer Park, St. Helena
  - Oakville/Rutherford - Oakville, Rutherford
  - Yountville
  - Napa
  - Outlying Areas - American Canyon, Angwin, Lake Berryessa, Pope Valley
  - Alphabetical Listings
- **Visitors Info**
  - Associations
  - Chambers of Commerce / Visitors Bureaus
  - Photo Tour
  - Reservation Service
  - Transportation
  - Travel Guides and Brochures
  - Weather
  - Past Months Newsletters

Through most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the Niagara Region of Ontario, Canada, produced low quality wines, but beginning in 1975 the region started to shift to high quality table wines. Now the region has more than 20,000 acres in vineyards, fifty-two wineries, and more than 300,000 visitors annually (Telfer 2001). Wineries report that 50 to 100 percent of their sales are on-site and that wine tours provide an important venue for those sales. Visitors typically spend \$50 to \$500 on wine.

“Tastes of Niagara” is a strategic alliance that has developed to expand the benefit of wine-based tourism by including the region’s food producers, processors, distributors, hotels, wineries, restaurants, and chefs in order to promote the use of local products in the tourism industry (Telfer 2001). Vineyards and wineries have become the focus of a wide variety of associated activities that increase tourism and also provide additional economic opportunities for local residents. These activities include the following:

- hot air balloon rides over the vineyards
- chef series – wine and food pairings
- comedy weekends
- weekends of gardening and wine
- stargazing
- antique and classic car shows
- artists in the vineyard
- hiking and horseback riding through the vineyards

### **Conservation and preservation**

Wine trails clearly have an important economic value because they serve as a major promotional and sales mechanism for wineries and wine regions. Wine tourism does not stimulate conservation of natural ecosystems because it is based on cultivated vineyards. However, these are recognized as having a certain natural attraction (Socher and Tschurtschenthaler 1994). Wine tourism does provide motivation for landscape improvement and historic preservation (Telfer 2001).

### **Regional/ community identity**

Wine tourism can also provide regional/community identity. As Dickenson and Salt (1982) quoted in Hall and Macionis (1998: 198) stated “The geography of wine is an experience of place... Its production is intensely geographical, with wines being identified more by location than anything else.”

## National Scenic Byways Nationwide

### Economic impacts

National Scenic Byways were first designated in 1996. To date 136 byways have been designated in thirty-nine states (Appendix 2). The National Scenic Byways Resource Center is currently conducting a review and analysis of the twenty-one economic impact studies that have been conducted on National Scenic Byways and other similar travel routes (Hanka 2002). Although the study has not been publicly released, its preliminary findings indicate that there is no clear understanding of the economic impacts that result from designation as a National Scenic Byway. There are three reasons for this. First, most of the studies did not use comparable methods and often the methods were inadequate or biased. Second, it is extremely difficult to clearly isolate total tourism expenditures from other expenditures, especially where the community and countryside comprise the attractions, as opposed to a tourism destination attraction such as Disney World. Third, byways are almost exclusively organized by local individuals and groups who do not have the resources or recognize the usefulness of conducting baseline economic studies before the byway is developed.

A study recently released by the Kansas Scenic Byways Program was not included in the review described above, but does offer some insight into the business impacts of the 48-mile long Flint Hills Scenic Byway in east central Kansas (Kansas Scenic Byways Program 2001). The study found that visitors to the byway spent only about \$50 per group per day. This can be compared to usual estimates of tourism expenditures in the range of \$55 to \$114 per day per person for Texas rural and heritage tourism (Texas Department of Economic Development 2001, The Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University *et al* 1999). The reason for such low daily expenditures is the fact that 54 percent of the visitors did not spend the night in the region.

Even though visitor expenditures were low, local businesses were positive about the impacts of the byway. No businesses reported negative impacts. Of the businesses that considered themselves to be tourist-related (N = 52), 82 percent reported a positive impact of the byway. Surprisingly, of the businesses that did not consider themselves to be tourist-related (N = 50), almost 40 percent reported a positive impact of the byway. However, the overall magnitude of this economic impact is unclear. While 54 percent of the tourist-related businesses reported an actual increase in customers, less than half (47

percent) of those businesses actually hired new employees. No figures were given for the number of new hires, but the total number of tourism-related business was 52, so the number that hired new employees was 13 ( $52 \times 0.54 \times 0.47$ ). Nor does the report state if these were part time or full time, seasonal, or permanent employees. The study was based on a survey made in August, which is the peak tourism season for the region.

Most survey respondents (69 percent) reported that byways had increased business opportunities in communities along the byway. Bike rental, coffee houses, home sales, retail business, recreation, bed and breakfasts, restaurants, antique stores, and galleries were specified by respondents as types of businesses that were stimulated by the byway. Survey respondents were unclear about the effect of the byway on adjacent land values. None indicated a decrease in land values, 39 percent indicated increases, 36 percent no change, and 25 percent said they had no way to judge the effect of the byway on land values. No respondents reported conflicts between the byway and other economic activities.

## **Conservation and preservation**

National Scenic Byways have an outstanding record in motivating and funding conservation and preservation as demonstrated by the various awards presented to Scenic Byways (Table 13).



**Table 13: Conservation and Preservation Awards to National Scenic Byways**

<b>Project/Location</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Award</b>
Preservation of Historic Oregon Coast Bridges Pacific Coast Scenic Byway, Oregon	Restored 8 historic bridges	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Best Practices Award, 2001
Historic Preservation Plan, San Juan Skyway, Colorado	Plan led to preservation of 13 endangered historic sites and protection of 3,320 acres of historic landscapes	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Best Practices Award, 2001
Cumberland County Covered Bridge, The National Road, Illinois	Reproduction of a 1830s era covered bridge.	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Best Practices Award, 2001
Flint Hills Scenic Byway Overlook, Flint Hills Scenic Byway, Kansas	Overlook along the largest remaining tallgrass prairie ecosystem in the U.S.	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Best Practices Award, 2001
Historic Columbia River State Trail, Historic Columbia River Highway, Oregon	Restored and reopened historic tunnel, constructed trails, and added 39 interpretive panels	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Best Practices Award, 2001
Logan Canyon Interpretive Project, Logan Canyon Scenic Byway, Utah	Interpretive project	Federal Highway Administration, Scenic Byways Competition, 2002

(Sources: *Vistas*, October 2001, June 2002)

The Mountains to Sound Greenway in Washington exemplifies the conservation potential of a National Scenic Byway (*Vistas* 2002). As Interstate Highway 90 was completed into Seattle from the east, local residents became concerned that it would open the highly scenic area to expansive sprawl. The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust was formed, including representatives of all the major landowners along the highway, the forest industry, and environmentalists. In 1998 the route was designated as a National Scenic Byway, the first high-speed interstate highway to be designated. The Trust recognized that it was impossible and undesirable to establish public ownership or control over the large expanse of private land, so it worked with the forest industry to develop the concept of “working forests,” based on the recognition that “trees grow back” (*Vistas* 2002: 6).

The Corridor Management Plan for the Mountains to Sound Greenway is a unique working tool.

*It takes the form of a map of the scenic highway corridor and surrounding viewsheds, towns and natural systems. Greenway objectives for specific places are laid out in discrete paragraphs all over the map. Responsibility for achieving Greenway goals at a given location is up to the stakeholders, identified in each case: agencies and jurisdictions, businesses and community groups (Vistas 2002: 7).*

The Greenway operates environmental education programs for students and teachers (<http://www.mtsgreenway.org>). Since 1995 volunteers have spent more than 70,000 hours on conservation and stewardship projects (Vistas 2002).

About 75 percent of the National Scenic Byways respondents surveyed as part of this study indicated that the byway had stimulated preservation/conservation activities. See Appendix 3 for the list of preservation/conservation activities from byway survey respondents.

### **Regional/community identity**

National Scenic Byways lend to the process of developing regional and community identity through interpretation and recognition at the state, national, and international levels. All National Scenic Byways are required to carry out interpretive and marketing activities. In addition, all National Scenic Byways are promoted by the Federal Highway Administration, so they all contribute to regional and community identity.

Specific examples of interpretation and marketing include a 30-minute video about the San Juan Skyway in Colorado and a community-to-community outreach program for the Lake Champlain Byway in New York and Vermont.

The Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway in south central Colorado provides a clear example of the effect of a byway on regional/community identity (Besculides, Lee, and McCormick 2002). Hispanic residents of the byway region gave high ranking to the following effects of the byway:

- “greater pride in my community”
- “greater knowledge of my own culture”
- “maintenance of my traditional way of life”

“a better sense of my place in the history of the San Luis Valley”  
“being part of a community rich in culture and history”  
“feeling good about the way we are caring for our cultural heritage”  
(Besculides, Lee, and McCormick 2002: 310)

## **National Scenic Byways and Other Themed Travel Routes in Neighboring States**

This study examined themed travel route programs in states that adjoin Texas (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) and states that share Texas’ southwestern tourism market niche (Arizona, Colorado, and Utah). This section of the report is based on personal and telephone interviews with state scenic byway directors and on personal inspection of selected byways in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. The analysis in this section does not deal with economic impacts, conservation/ preservation, and regional/community identity as do the previous sections. Instead, this section focuses on the purposes, characteristics, and operation of scenic byway programs in the selected states.

### **Arkansas**

Arkansas has two National Scenic Byways and eight other scenic routes. Of those eight, five are sponsored by the US Forest Service, one by the State of Arkansas, and two are joint projects of the State and the US Forest Service.

For the National Scenic Byways, the Corridor Management Plans (CMP) are written by local byway partners. The state has no political “test,” and no regulations for Corridor Management Plans. Property rights concerns are as strong in Arkansas as in Texas, so the emphasis is on working with people and on benefits, not sanctions. The CMPs contain very little on resource protection. They do not address sensitive issues, and are as “vague as possible.” Byway groups have done neighbor-to-neighbor projects, such as helping move derelict autos for free. Rather than regulations, the CMPs emphasize interpretive and marketing plans (Weston 2002).

### **Louisiana**

Louisiana has seventeen scenic byways, one of which is designated as a National Scenic Byway. Fifteen of the remaining byways are sponsored by the State of Louisiana and one is a joint project with the State and the US Forest Service.

Louisiana is unusual in that the Office of Tourism is the lead scenic byway agency, rather than the Department of Transportation. Louisiana uses byways primarily as marketing tools. Local groups handle all of the byway planning and regulation and write the Corridor Management Plans. The Corridor Management Plans focus on tourism and promotion. The only state limitation is that no new billboards can be constructed on a byway (Bromell 2002).

## **New Mexico**

New Mexico has twenty-four scenic byways, six of which have been designated as National Scenic Byways (Attachment 1). The other eighteen are part of the state scenic byway program.

The New Mexico Byways program is not regulatory. The federal prohibition of new billboards on designated National Scenic Byways is the only regulation of the program. The program has “no teeth” except de-designation. The program has not affected local people by government projects or regulations. Instead, just the opposite has happened. Local people thought the byways designation could be used to stop highway projects that they did not want and tried to use designation for that purpose. Because the Scenic Byway program was being used to oppose state projects, the New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department put a moratorium on new byways in 1998, which has only recently been lifted. Local people tried to keep a utility line from being constructed on a byway, but were not successful (Evans 2002).

In New Mexico the Corridor Management Plans are not regulatory, but are “advisory.” New Mexico has had no problems with corridor management plans affecting private land. The Geronimo Trail goes through large ranches owned by Ted Turner, and he has made no complaint. The Corrales Byway has submitted a grant to purchase development rights of farmland (Evans 2002).

The main problem experienced in New Mexico is with interpretive centers that were funded by Scenic Byway grants from the Federal Highway Administration. One byway group wants to convert their \$400,000 interpretive center into a retail store and office space. Another group closed their \$400,000 visitor center. One town uses its interpretive center for community activities, with poor interpretation. Neither the

state nor the federal government have control over how the buildings are used after they are constructed (Evans 2002).

Historic Route 66 National Byway has formed a non-profit corporation. They were planning to pay a president, but a retired volunteer has taken responsibility, working without pay. They publish a professional-quality quarterly magazine. The magazine is sold for \$4, with local vendors getting a share. The organization also has dues-paying members that support the byway.

An important operational problem is that local volunteers do not understand grantsmanship – timing, proper expenditures, management, and reporting. Also, success of a byway depends on the initiative of local individuals, but they “burn out” quickly (Evans 2002).

The Scenic Byway Program has been “nothing but positive for New Mexico” (Evans 2002). It brings revenue to the state and establishes local pride. The program “is a win/win.” However, the major words of wisdom from the Byways Director were “Don’t build interpretive centers” (Evans 2002).

Personal inspection of Route 66 and El Camino Real National Scenic Byways indicated that national designation had no clearly obvious effect on the routes or the land in their corridors. Much of Route 66 follows the current Interstate 40, some of it on the new road, and some on the old road which often serves as the frontage road for the interstate highway. For these sections, there is little incentive to follow the designated route; in fact, the route can be unpleasant and even dangerous due to the interstate highway’s entry and exit ramps.

El Camino Real National Scenic Byway also follows modern roads, including Interstate 25. Most of the designated route between Albuquerque and Socorro is on state roads adjacent to the Interstate.

## **Oklahoma**

Oklahoma has one state scenic byway. Oklahoma did not consider participation in the National Scenic Byway Program until the funding policy was changed to remove the discrimination against donor states. The State is now developing a state program to mirror the federal program and has contracted with a group from the University of Oklahoma to administer the program (Smith 2002).

Preparations are now being made to nominate the Talimena Scenic Drive as a National Scenic Byway. This route is on National Forest land. The state received a Scenic Byways grant to prepare the Corridor Management Plan. The US Forest Service is the sponsoring agency. The state is also working on a plan to apply for designation for the segment of historic Route 66 that passes through Oklahoma (Smith 2002).

The policy in Oklahoma now is to avoid byways that involve private property because it would be difficult to develop a workable Corridor Management Plan with total compliance. Metropolitan counties have planning and zoning, but rural counties have not adopted land use control authority (Smith 2002).

## **Arizona**

Arizona currently has only one designated National Scenic Byway – Route 67 from Jacob Lake to the North Rim of Grand Canyon National Park. This byway is totally within federal lands (National Forest and National Park), so its corridor is managed within the regulations of those agencies.

Arizona has a well-established state byways program and intends to apply for National Scenic Byway designation for more routes (Garcia 2002). Contrary to the “advisory” character of scenic byway programs of the other states included in this study, Arizona is clearly regulatory in its approach to state scenic byways. Regarding the “desirable zone of influence” of a scenic byway, the state’s Application Procedures instruct applicants to

*Define an area to either side of the roadway that would be necessary to protect the resources from damaging encroachment. These areas will be generally the same as the viewshed, but may need to be further clarified. Give linear measurements for the corridors and illustrate on a map (Arizona Department of Transportation Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads Advisory Committee 1993, 24).*

Regarding development of the desirable zone of influence, the Application Procedures state that

*Development along all Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads should be environmentally compatible. The Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads Advisory Committee recommends that local and county planning and zoning departments implement protective zoning regulations or design review overlay zoning along designated roadways.*

*These types of zoning regulations are necessary to protect, maintain and enhance the scenic quality along the highways. These regulations should also be incorporated in urban areas along the designated routes to help unify development patterns and enhance the visual quality (Arizona Department of Transportation Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads Advisory Committee 1993, 42).*

Arizona is currently developing Corridor Management Plans for some of its state byways so they may apply for National Scenic Byway designation. However, if there is any objection from adjacent landowners, federal designation will not be pursued (Garcia 2002).

## **Colorado**

Colorado has one of the most successful scenic byways programs in the country (Hanka 2002). Colorado currently has twenty-three byways, eight of which have National Scenic Byways designation. For fiscal years 1992 through 2001 Colorado received \$8,364,615 in National Scenic Byways funding and matched these funds with \$2,731,706 raised locally, with little financial support from the Colorado Department of Transportation. The Colorado Scenic Byway Program also received \$620,410 from the Colorado State Historical Fund (America's Byways Resource Center 2002).

Most of Colorado's Scenic Byways pass through public lands, but not all of them. For example, the Pawnee Trail is on the plains in ranch country, and the byway organization is composed of landowners. One rancher, who opposed original designation, now likes it because of road maintenance improvements. Property rights issues have to be handled locally. Counties have variable planning capabilities and some do not have zoning authority (Pearce 2002).

People are concerned about excessive growth. Some local byway organizations have acquired open space via purchase or transfer of development rights. There is a "mentality" toward easements. The primary focus of the program is on interpretation and marketing, not regulation and resource protection. Most people don't even know the byways are federally designated (Pearce 2002).

## **Utah**

Utah has twenty-seven scenic byways, five of which are currently designated as National Scenic Byways and one All American Road. Utah scenic byways are major roads suitable for all passenger vehicles. The state also has four “special highways,” and fifty-eight “scenic backways.” Scenic backways are separated from other themed routes because they are not suitable for year-round travel by standard passenger cars, as required by the national scenic byway program.

These eighty-nine travel routes are described in a highly professional, four-color book available for free at travel information centers. (See Attachment 2). The interpretive content of this book is concise and especially well-written and the maps are clear and detailed.

Much of the land in Utah is under federal ownership and management. Most of the scenic routes are within those lands and are managed according to the applicable federal regulations. Utah has set a very high standard in the number of themed routes, the quality of their interpretation, and their dramatic beauty.



## **Chapter 5**

### **Feasibility Analysis of a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program for Texas**

This section analyzes the feasibility of each of the two major purposes of the National Scenic Byways Program in the context of the State of Texas. Those purposes are (1) to maintain the intrinsic qualities of byways and (2) stimulate local economic development through tourism. The analysis is based on examinations of the strengths and opportunities, weaknesses and threats of each of the program goals.

#### **Purpose 1: Maintain the intrinsic qualities of byways**

##### **Strengths and opportunities of a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program related to maintenance of intrinsic qualities of byways**

Scenic Byways can help maintain the intrinsic qualities of roads and regions through regulations and public sentiment. The Corridor Management Plan of the National Scenic Byways Program appears to require that the byway organization develop specific methods, perhaps including zoning, to ensure maintenance of intrinsic qualities. However, as discussed above, the resource protection requirement is powerless. Although inherently controversial and contentious, such regulations have traditionally been the means by which cities in Texas protect the health, safety, and environmental quality aspects of their jurisdictions.

Economic functionality and public sentiment are more subtle means to protect intrinsic qualities. If a place is economically important or if people care about it, they often devise means to protect and care for it. The Alamo and the San Antonio River Walk are prime examples of this process in Texas. As described in Chapter 4, wine routes in California, Canada, and Europe are important examples of how thematic travel routes can serve an important economic function.

Maintaining intrinsic qualities of scenic roads presents several important opportunities to Texans, whether that result is achieved by regulations or through public sentiment. The economic functions of rural regions are changing substantially. Traditionally, Texas rural areas have provided food and fiber to urban markets. While that is still important in Texas, and should remain so, rural areas now provide other products to their urban customers. Those products include recreation/tourism and watershed/habitat values. Thus, the

scenic, natural, historic, cultural, archaeological, and recreational qualities have important economic value (Bunce 1998, McGranahan 1999, Drabenstott 2000, Hoggart and Paniagua 2001). In many parts of Texas rural land is priced far beyond its productive value because people value its beauty and other amenities. Scenic roads offer a “showcase” of the range of rural values and products and raise the consciousness of those values in the minds of both rural residents and their urban visitors.

Perhaps more importantly, maintaining intrinsic qualities makes rural areas better places to live. One of the advantages of tourism based on natural and cultural features is that if a place is sufficiently attractive to bring in visitors, it is usually a nice place to live as well (McGranahan 1999, McDaniel 2000).

**Weaknesses and threats of a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program related to maintenance of intrinsic qualities of byways**

Taken at face value, the Corridor Management Plan requires formalized means to ensure that intrinsic qualities will be protected. In Texas such means of land use control exist only in incorporated cities and state and federally-owned lands. The rural areas of the state, where many scenic byways would naturally be located, do not have the regulatory mechanisms to formulate, implement, or enforce a Corridor Management Plan. The land use regulation authority of Texas counties is usually limited to very specific aspects of subdivision development, and clearly does not involve the kinds of zoning powers that are implied in the Corridor Management Plan.

The United States Constitution and the heritage of private landownership in Texas give primacy to certain private rights over public rights, especially in unincorporated areas. The primary implication of land use regulation is that the government will decide how private land is used – some land may generate large profits and other land may generate smaller profits or none at all, depending on its use. Texas county officials are generally reluctant to consider land use controls because such controls clearly put them in the position of determining winners and losers regarding use potential. The contentiousness of the local political process is substantially increased when such regulations are considered. Thus, the land use requirements for a Corridor Management Plan as stated in the “Notice of interim policy” could pose an important threat to landowners and local officials if they were actually implemented as regulations.

In practice, Corridor Management Plans have not been problematic for existing byways. Respondents to the National

Scenic Byway survey conducted as part of this study indicated that most of their byways include private land in the Corridor Management Plan (74 percent), but only 17 percent reported any conflicts regarding the CMP. The conflicts had to do with reduced speed limits, restrictions on truck traffic, concerns about increased traffic, and prohibition of billboards.

## **Purpose 2: Stimulate local economic development through tourism**

### **Strengths and opportunities of a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program related to economic development through tourism**

Rural areas across the globe have undergone a major transition in the past fifty years, from economies that were based largely on food, fiber, and raw material production, to economic decline in those primary industries and increasing demand (in some areas) for more intangible experiences and amenities (Johnson and Scott 1997, Butler and Hall 1998, Saeter 1998, McGranahan 1999, Barkema and Drabenstott 2000, McDaniel 2000, Drabenstott and Sheaff 2001, Johnson 2001, Bryden 2002, Drabenstott 2002, Henderson 2002, Nilsson 2002). Although agriculture and raw material production remain strong economic sectors in rural Texas, residents of many rural areas seek means to diversify their economic base (Rylander 2001).

Tourism is the most obvious means of economic diversification for rural areas. The existing countryside and rural life comprise the attractions, so little has to be invested. The majority of the population is urban and desires a contrast to their daily lives, so there is demand for the rural tourism product. Travelers to rural Texas spent \$2.25 billion in 1999 (Texas Department of Economic Development 2001). The economic downturn of 2001 and concerns for security have increased demand for leisure experiences close to home and accessible by automobile (Texas Department of Economic Development 2002).

There is clearly a substantial demand for travel experiences that are met by rural areas in Texas. However, that demand cannot be met solely by public lands. Texas has relatively little public land (less than 6 percent). It is not likely that public land holdings will increase commensurately with the projected population increase, so there is an opportunity for rural communities and landowners to meet the demand for leisure experiences. In its draft *Land and Water Resources Conservation Plan*, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department recognizes the important role of private rural land in meeting recreation needs, stating:

*Texas landowners provide recreational opportunities, conserve water and maintain wildlife diversity. TPWD cannot succeed in its responsibilities to protect fish and wildlife resources without good partnerships with private landowners. The Department also cannot serve the public's demand for outdoor recreation without the efforts of private landowners.*  
(Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 2002b)

Thus, rural tourism can meet an important demand in Texas while providing an opportunity for rural economic development.

Themed travel trails such as scenic byways are effective means to develop rural tourism (Mitchell 1998; Davidson 2001; Godin and Broderick 2001; Newman 2001; Telfer 2001; Wilson, Fesenmaier, Fesenmaier, and van Es 2001). For visitors to be attracted to a place there must be a sufficient critical mass of attractions for the place to be “visible” and recognized. In other words, a single community or ranch would have trouble making itself known in urban areas, but a region such as the Texas Hill Country is visible and attractive. A Scenic Byway can provide a theme that gives a region an identity and can make it more visible. Each of the individual attractions benefits from the visibility of the larger region.

Scenic Byways can provide effective interpretation, which is essential for rural tourism to be successful in most of Texas. Interpretation is the “story” of the place. In many cases the story is the most important part of the tourism product. Even in the most dramatic parts of Texas, such as the Trans Pecos, visitors find more value if they understand the desert, the mountains, and the long human heritage in the region. Interpretation must be thematic, and a Scenic Byway can provide the theme.

The National Scenic Byways Program provides important promotional and marketing services. The Federal Highway Administration's National Scenic Byways Program Marketing Plan of January 2001 specifies the following goals:

1. Achieve an increase of 20 percent in overall familiarity with the program among consumers.
2. Aggressively pursue sponsorship opportunities to augment the budget and to build brand identity through borrowed equity.
3. Create a brand presence on the website.

4. Establish a stronger presence within the travel industry through outreach and education.
5. Build awareness and understanding of marketing program and brand building concepts within byway community.
6. Expand the research base.
7. Develop more effective marketing relationships with the byway organizations.

Pursuant to the goals listed above, the National Scenic Byways Organization has established the brand of “America’s Roads.” This brand and its logo are used on promotional material, including an Internet site ([www.byways.org](http://www.byways.org)) and a map that is available on request. The promotion is national and international. Because a National Scenic Byway is promoted as one of America’s “best” it receives a level of attention and credibility that would be difficult to achieve otherwise (Davidson 2001).

On June 13, 2002, Travel Industry Association of America President and CEO William S. Norman and U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta announced a marketing partnership, "See America’s Byways." "See America’s Byways" began on Labor Day weekend, 2002, with local events on many byways to encourage travel. The marketing program includes distribution of "See America’s Byways" posters and roadmaps, website links, and new itineraries to promote travel on the byways.

In addition to promotional services, the National Scenic Byways Program provides important technical assistance and networking opportunities to individuals and organizations involved in scenic byways. America’s Byways Resource Center organizes conferences and training workshops. It also publishes the *Vistas* newsletter, sponsors research, and maintains data bases and a resource library ([www.byways.org](http://www.byways.org)).

The National Scenic Byways Program offers competitive grants that can support local tourism development. The federal share of grants is 80 percent, with a required state match of 20 percent. Eligible activities for grant funds are shown in Table 14. Grant awards for 2002 are shown in Appendix 1.

**Table 14: Eligible Activities for Scenic Byway Grants from the FHWA**

Activities related to the planning, design, and/or management of a State scenic byway program.

Development and implementation of a corridor management plan to maintain the scenic, historical, recreational, cultural, natural, and archeological characteristics of a byway corridor while providing for accommodation of increased tourism and development of related amenities.

Safety improvements to a State scenic byway, National Scenic Byway, or All-American Road to the extent that the improvements are necessary to accommodate increased traffic and changes in the types of vehicles using the highway as a result of the designation of a State scenic byway, National Scenic Byway, or All-American Road.

Construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists, rest area, turnout, highway shoulder improvement, passing lane, overlooks, and/or interpretive facility.

An improvement to a scenic byway that will enhance access to an area for the purpose of recreation, including water-related recreation.

Protection of scenic, historical, recreational, cultural, natural, and archeological resources in an area adjacent to a scenic byway.

Development and provision of tourist information to the public, including interpretive information about a scenic byway.

Development and implementation of a scenic byway marketing program.

**Obligation  
limitation  
removed**

From inception of the program until 1997 Scenic Byway funding was subject to Obligation Limitation by the Federal Highway Administration, meaning that Scenic Byway grants would displace other federal transportation funding and Texas would not receive new or additional funds. However, in TEA-21 (1998-2003) Congress amended the Scenic Byway funding policy, so that the Obligation Limitation no longer applies, and grants to Texas would be in addition to the regular federal transportation funding.

Tourism as a form of rural economic development has some fundamental and important weaknesses. Those weaknesses include the following: seasonal, low wage jobs; vulnerability of tourism to economic changes and changes in tourism demand; low return to landowners; emphasis on traditional agriculture which may be uneconomic; and negative socioeconomic impacts. Each of these is discussed below in detail.

*Seasonal, low wage  
jobs*

Tourism is dominated by niche markets, but most of the niche markets have definite seasonality (Opperman 1998, Nilsson 2002). Families with children typically travel only in the summer, while retirees may not want to travel during the hot months, and most travel during holiday seasons is to visit relatives. The attractions of a region may be seasonal as well, as with fall colors or summer water sports. With careful planning a region may develop attractions that appeal to different niche markets throughout the year. However, a given tourism enterprise may have less flexibility to appeal to various niche markets, so it will be subjected to seasonal income and part-time jobs (Butler and Hall 1998).

Tourism generates jobs, but many of them are entry-level service jobs with low pay. Most rural tourism enterprises are “Mom and Pop” operations that do not generate new employment, but draw on the labor of the family. For example, in Denmark Hjalager (1996) found that farm-based tourism resulted in an 11 percent increase in farm income, but required an 18 percent increase in time expenditure to gain that income. She concluded that “...traditional agriculture is still much more efficient than rural tourism in regard to generating earnings” (Hajlager 1996:106).

*Vulnerability of  
tourism*

Tourism is a discretionary expenditure and is one of the first activities to be cut when families and individuals feel pinched financially. Thus, tourism is highly vulnerable to economic fluctuations (Hopkins 1998, Mitchell 1998, Nelson 2001.) Rural tourism is also subject to competition from other forms of tourism and entertainment, many of which are heavily funded and have powerful marketing organizations, such as the Disney organization, cruise lines, and professional sports.

Tourism activities and destinations also go through a life cycle wherein demand grows, peaks, and diminishes as consumer interests change or a place loses its popularity (Butler 1980). Reversing such trends can be difficult and expensive, as demonstrated by Las Vegas, Nevada’s recent reimagining of itself.

*Low return to  
landowners*

In Texas, most of the landscape that would serve as an attraction for Scenic Byway travelers is privately owned. However, most of the \$2.25 billion spent on rural tourism in Texas in 1999 was spent on transportation (23.2%), lodging (20.2%), and food (20.2%) (Texas Department of Economic Development 2001). This means that expenditures were made

largely in communities where those services are available, not on farms or ranches. Thus, the people who bear the expense to own and maintain the attractions do not receive many of the economic benefits of rural tourism.

There has been an effort in Texas for the past ten years to encourage landowners to develop tourism enterprises on their own property. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Texas Historical Commission, Texas Department of Economic Development, Texas Department of Agriculture, Texas Department of Transportation, Texas A&M University, Southwest Texas State University, and the Texas Travel Industry Association have provided technical and financial assistance. A number of landowners have developed enterprises or are in the process of doing so, largely motivated by the need to diversify income due to the difficult economic conditions of agriculture.

A thorough literature review and consultation with rural tourism research professionals (Skadberg 2002) revealed no empirical studies of the economic costs and benefits of rural tourism for the individual landowner in Texas or the United States. However, there has been a substantial effort to study and assess rural tourism in Europe. Nilsson (2002) summarized the economic effects of farm tourism on individual farm operators in Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and Wales. He concluded that "Farm tourism is not a good business for all. Records from different countries show poor turnover and negligible revenue" (Nilsson 2002, 21). Although the tradition of rural tourism dates back more than 150 years in Germany, Opperman (1996) reported that an average of only 16.6 percent of farm income is derived from tourism. However, this amount may be important to the overall viability of an agricultural enterprise and should not be discounted. It is clear that tourism is not an economic panacea for rural problems, and Scenic Byways should not be promoted as a solution to the economic problems of rural America.

The survey of National Scenic Byways that was part of this study confirmed the findings in the literature discussed above. When asked if the byway had stimulated business opportunities for farmers, ranchers, or other landowners along its route, 69 percent of the responses were positive and 31 percent were negative.

Landowners and other rural residents may derive important non-economic benefits from tourism. Opperman (1996, 98) stated that "...many farmers run their tourism business more



for the social contacts it provides them with rather than for the money they could possibly earn from it..." Tourism was shown to stimulate demand for agricultural products in Hawaii (Cox, Fox, Bowen 1995). Tourism is also a fundamental part of the wine industry (Hall and Macdonald 1998; Tefler 2001).

Great Britain and Austria recognize the important role of landowners in maintaining the scenic landscape. The governments of those countries provide various subsidies to offset landowner costs. In Great Britain landowners can be paid up to £300 (pounds sterling) per hectare for providing public access. Shoard (1996, 21) as quoted in Jenkins and Prin (1998, 186) stated:

*Farmers now get £247 per mile per year merely for allowing people to walk along access strips ten metres wide along the sides of or across fields in ESAs (Environmentally Sensitive Areas...*

*The right of exclusion is being increasingly used to turn access into a tradeable asset. The government's endorsement of the right of the landowner to charge others to set foot on his or her land puts the official seal of approval on the notion that access to the countryside is a commodity to be bought from landowners rather than a free public good.*

Socher and Tschurtschenthaler (1994) emphasized that appropriate cultivation of the landscape provides value to regional tourism in Austria, but that farmers receive no direct benefits from tourism and should be compensated for maintaining attractive agricultural landscapes.

*Emphasis on  
traditional  
agriculture*

Rural tourism has almost exclusively been perceived and marketed as a form of nostalgia, based on traditional agricultural methods and products (Hjalager 1996; Dewailley 1998; Hopkins 1998; Mitchell 1998; Nilsson 2002). Unfortunately, this places the agricultural operator in a position that may be uneconomic because traditional methods were labor intensive. In Texas, the visitors' expectations for working ranch experiences have forced ranch-based tourism operators to redefine and refocus their business away from an agricultural orientation (Meador 2002).

On the other hand, proper interpretation of modern agriculture can provide an interesting rural tourism product. Many urban residents have little understanding of modern agriculture.

More importantly, many urban residents have negative attitudes about agriculture. Effective interpretation of modern agriculture could generate a better public understanding of the problems faced by landowners and the agricultural industry.

*Negative  
socioeconomic  
impacts*

Negative socioeconomic impacts related to the National Scenic Byways Program include trespass, disruption of agricultural and forestry production and other economic activities, and transportation conflicts. Each of these is discussed below.

Trespass can be encouraged by designation of a road as a National Scenic Byway. The official signs, map, interpretive information, and visitor center give the tourist a sense that they are in a public park. This implies that everything along the road is part of the attraction. One implication of the Corridor Management Plan is that everything in the Scenic Byway Corridor is part of the attractiveness and importance of the byway. This “park” mentality is expressed by visitors using the attractions as they would a park or other public land. They cross fences to get a better view, take a hike, photograph a cow, or have a picnic. These activities can easily be observed on the Willow City loop north of Fredericksburg, Texas, during the height of the wildflower season. Such trespass activities can pose major problems for landowners. Although the potential exists for increases of trespass resulting from a scenic byway, only one respondent to the survey indicated that trespass was a problem. However, survey respondents were byway officials, not landowners.

Agricultural and forestry production and other economic activities are impacted by Scenic Byways in several ways. Trespassers may trample crops, disturb livestock, tamper with equipment, or set fires. However, the most serious potential threat of the Scenic Byways Program to agricultural production and other economic activities is the Corridor Management Plan. Productive land use is not necessarily scenic. Harvesting, especially timber, has a major effect on scenic qualities. Agricultural equipment and buildings are designed for utility, not beauty. Thus, a management plan that restrained or regulated productive activities would have a major impact on the landowners’ ability to conduct their normal activities. In addition, landowners could be limited in making changes to land use type, such as subdividing land for residential development. At this time, Texas counties can regulate *how* land is subdivided, but not *whether* it can be subdivided. As discussed in detail in previous chapters, the National Scenic Byway Program currently has no regulatory

### *Transportation conflicts*

authority over land use, although the interim policy statement outlines specific regulatory requirements.

The popular image of a scenic byway is that of a winding road, inviting the traveler to drive slowly, stopping frequently to enjoy and learn from the landscape. The reality of Texas rural roads is that they were established to provide farmers and ranchers access to towns and markets (Farm to Market Roads and Ranch Roads). Most of the roads do not have shoulders, and the speed limits are often 65 to 70 miles per hour. Rural people use these roads for daily activities as well as occasional emergency access. A substantial number of slow-moving tourists can reduce the utility of the road for local residents and can even pose safety and security problems.

Most respondents to the survey (77 percent) indicated that there were no conflicts regarding speed on the byway. However, some respondents specified that there were conflicts between fast local traffic and slow driving visitors.

## **Feasibility of a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program**

Although a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program would offer some potential benefits in terms of landscape preservation and economic development assistance, such a program would face two difficult problems in Texas.

1. There is currently no legal mechanism in Texas rural areas to develop, implement, or enforce the required Corridor Management Plan. Land use regulation is highly controversial and contentious in Texas. Rural elected officials are unwilling to introduce such an unpopular issue, especially motivated by something as controversial as a federally-backed tourism program.
2. Rural tourism can provide economic benefits to communities. However, benefits to landowners are less clear, even though they must bear the costs of owning and maintaining the resources that would be directly affected by the Corridor Management Plan. Landowners also may receive the greatest negative impacts from tourism.

For the reasons described above, we conclude that a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program is not feasible for Texas at this time.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Assessment of the Feasibility of Alternatives to a State-wide National Scenic Byways Program**

#### **Alternatives**

There are four alternatives to a state-wide National Scenic Byways Program. Those alternatives are (1) no action, (2) a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on public lands, (3) a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on which all landowners agree to a transfer of development rights to an agency or organization that can develop, implement, and enforce a Corridor Management Plan, and (4) a clearinghouse to coordinate and promote existing scenic and thematic roads in Texas. The following sections describe and assess the strengths and opportunities, weaknesses and threats of each of the alternatives.

#### **1. No action**

Texas has had official travel trails since at least 1967. A variety of local, state, federal, and industry organizations currently operate and promote travel routes in Texas (Table 15). This alternative consists of continuing with the status quo.

#### **Strengths and opportunities of no action**

This alternative raises no new costs or controversies such as land use control in the byway corridor. It also allows established programs, such as those of the Texas Department of Transportation, Texas Historical Commission, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and others to continue without the confusion that would likely result if there were a mixture of National Scenic Byways and other travel routes in the state.

#### **Weaknesses and threats of no action**

Taking no action would fail to establish any regulatory means to ensure maintenance of the intrinsic qualities of outstanding landscapes in the state. No action would also result in loss of the marketing and promotional benefits offered by the National Scenic Byways Program or other alternatives.

## **2. A National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on public lands.**

National Scenic Byways could be established in any of the state or national parks, national forests, state and national wildlife management areas, or other public areas where land use is currently regulated by a public agency.

### **Strengths and opportunities of a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on public lands.**

This alternative would allow the state to participate in the National Scenic Byways Program and receive the national and international promotional benefits of the program without having to deal with the issues of land use control on private land.

### **Weaknesses and threats of a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on public lands.**

This alternative would not result in any increased preservation of intrinsic factors, since land that would be in the byway corridor is already under public management intended to protect those values. This alternative probably would not result in an appreciable increase in local economic development through tourism since the parks or other public areas already attract visitors and are promoted by a variety of means.

## **3. A National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on which all landowners agree to a transfer of development rights to an agency or organization that can develop, implement, and enforce a Corridor Management Plan.**

### **Transfer of development rights**

The legal process of transferring development rights allows landowners to sell or donate certain specified land use rights while retaining full ownership and use of the land for other rights (Texas Parks and Wildlife n.d.). The land may be sold or donated to a governmental agency or to a non-governmental organization that has the right and responsibility to implement and enforce land use controls. Landowners benefit because the book value of the land is reduced, thus decreasing inheritance taxes. If the development rights are sold, the landowner benefits directly. Landowners and the public benefit because the amenity values of the land are maintained, and in many places the amenity values are the highest value of the land.

This alternative might be especially useful in the wine producing regions of Texas. As described in Chapter 4, wine

producing regions use “wine routes” as marketing and promotional mechanisms for regional wineries. Transfer of development rights would help enable local residents to ensure the wine routes are managed so that the landscape is maintained in a manner that complements the marketing strategies of the wineries.

**Strengths and opportunities of a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on which all landowners agree to a transfer of development rights**

This alternative would help ensure protection of the intrinsic qualities of the region through the development, implementation, and enforcement of a Corridor Management Plan. It could provide benefits to landowners by reducing the book value of their land, by ensuring the maintenance of amenity values, and by providing an attractive context for certain economic activities such as wine production.

**Weaknesses and threats of a National Scenic Byways Program limited to roads on which all landowners agree to a transfer of development rights**

The primary problem with this alternative is that it is complex and probably would be difficult to implement. Although there is now substantial precedence for transfer of development rights in Texas, each situation is unique and the legal agreement must be individually tailored. In addition, some landowners are skeptical of the concept or reluctant to give up rights because of the uncertainty of what may be needed from the land in the future or what the ownership may be. For this alternative to be effective it would be necessary for all landowners along the byway to agree to the transfer of development rights, to the acceptance and support of the sponsoring organization, and to the provisions of the corridor management plan.

#### **4. A clearinghouse to coordinate and promote existing designated or thematic travel routes in Texas.**

Texas currently has more than forty designated or themed travel routes (Table 15), but there is no effective coordination to present a cohesive package to the traveler. This clearinghouse alternative could be as simple as a single Internet site that would provide links to the Internet sites for the current travel routes in Texas. If desirable and feasible, this alternative could include coordinated cooperative promotion and marketing, including the development of a brand image, as has been done with the National Scenic Byways Program. It could also include coordinated interpretive maps, brochures, and signage. Utah’s Scenic Byways and Backways program is a very good example of a well-planned coordinated state program (Attachment 2).

**Table 15: Designated or Themed Travel Routes in Texas**

Forest Trail	TxDoT, THC
Forts Trail	TxDoT, THC
Independence Trail	TxDoT, THC
Brazos Trail	TxDoT
Hill Country Trail	TxDoT
Lakes Trail	TxDoT
Mountain Trail	TxDoT
Pecos Trail	TxDoT
Plains Trail	TxDoT
Tropical Trail	TxDoT
Chisholm Trail	THC
Los Caminos del Rio	THC
Great Texas Coastal Birding Trail	TPWD
Heart of Texas Wildlife Trail	TPWD
High Plains Wildlife Trail	TPWD
Prairies and Pineywoods Wildlife Trail	TPWD
River Road	TPWD
Ross Maxwell Scenic Road	NPS
Balcones Wine Trail	Private
Brazos Wine Trail	Private
Munson Wine Trail	Private
Enchanted Wine Trail	Private
Highland Wine Trail	Private
Palo Duro Wine Trail	Private
Pecos Wine Trail	Private
Texas Melting Pot	Local, with FHWA funding
Wild West Texas	Local, with FHWA funding
Sea, Sounds and Sights	Local, with FHWA funding
Lone Star Heritage	Local, with FHWA funding
From the Coast to the Heart of Texas	Local, with FHWA funding
Movies, Music and Markets	Local, with FHWA funding
On the Waterfront	Local, with FHWA funding
Hot Texas BBQ	Local, with FHWA funding
Golf: Swinging in Texas	Local, with FHWA funding
Border Bargains	Local, with FHWA funding
Texas Film Tour	Local, with FHWA funding
Presidential Corridor Tour	Local, with FHWA funding
Davis Mountains Scenic Loop	Local
Wood County Autumn Trail	Local
Veterans Highway	
17 <sup>th</sup> Mountain Division Highway	
Old San Antonio Road	

Sponsors: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Park Service (NPS), Texas Department of Transportation (TxDoT), Texas Historical Commission (THC), Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)

**Strengths and opportunities of a clearinghouse for existing designated or thematic travel routes in Texas.**

This alternative would build on the effort and resources that have already been expended to develop travel routes in Texas. It could present the visitor with a cohesive and comprehensive program of travel routes. This alternative would also provide a substantial range of “products” to facilitate promotion. Due to the diversity of existing travel routes, coordinated interpretation would allow the visitors to enjoy the many and varied “stories” that make Texas what it is.

**Weaknesses and threats of a clearinghouse for existing designated or thematic travel routes in Texas.**

This alternative would not provide any regulatory authority to ensure preservation of the intrinsic qualities of the travel routes. Instead, promotion of the routes could lead to deterioration of intrinsic qualities as people develop “tourist” businesses to benefit from the increased travelers. This alternative could also be difficult to implement because the various agencies and organizations that have developed travel routes each have their own goals, strategies, methods, and funding.



## **Chapter 7**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

#### **Summary**

The National Scenic Byways Program has successfully developed and marketed travel routes in 39 states. The byways have brought some degree of economic benefit to their regions, although the amounts may be small. The byways have clearly provided a stimulus and mechanism for local conservation, preservation, and regional/ community identity benefits. America's Byways Resource Center provides technical assistance to local byways and the program offers the potential for grants.

On the other hand, the National Scenic Byways Program implies land use controls and the potential for federal regulation of private property. Texas already has more than forty designated or themed byways or travel routes. A state-wide National Scenic Byways Program would possibly conflict with existing travel routes.

#### **Recommendations**

The information in this report supports the following recommendations:

1. The State of Texas should consider adoption of a National Scenic Byways Program, limited to roads that pass through public land. This would allow the state to take advantage of the marketing efforts of the National Scenic Byways Program. All of the State's travel routes would be included on the National Scenic Byways web site. This recommendation would avoid the potential problems associated with establishing a National Scenic Byways Program on roads through private land.
2. A state agency, probably the Texas Department of Transportation Travel Division, should be funded to operate a clearinghouse of travel routes in Texas and to explore ways to develop a means of cooperation that would be beneficial to the various sponsors of travel routes, to local residents, and to the traveling public. This would provide the visitor with a cohesive and comprehensive "package" and would facilitate tourism product development across the state, especially in rural areas.

## **Chapter 8**

### **Summary of Texas Regulations Regarding Outdoor Advertising and Vegetation**

The National Scenic Byway Program has been effective in preventing new outdoor advertising on designated scenic byways. If Texas adopts a state-wide National Scenic Byway Program these outdoor advertising regulations would apply to roads that might be designated under that program. If Texas does not adopt a state-wide National Scenic Byway Program, but chooses one of the other alternatives discussed in this report, outdoor advertising will continue to be regulated by existing state law. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize current Texas regulations regarding outdoor advertising. This chapter does not discuss all of the specific Texas regulations for outdoor advertising signs. Instead, the intent of this summary is to compare existing state regulations to what would exist under National Scenic Byway designation.

Reiterating the outdoor advertising regulations of the National Scenic Byways Program:

*As provided at 23 U.S.C. 131(s), if a State has a State scenic byway program, the State may not allow the erection of new signs not in conformance with 23 U.S.C. 131© along any highway on the Interstate System or Federal-aid primary system which before, on, or after December 18, 1991, has been designated as a scenic byway under the State's scenic byway program. This prohibition would also apply to Interstate System and Federal-aid primary system highways that are designated scenic byways under the National Scenic Byways Program and All-American Roads Program, whether or not they are designated as State scenic byways.*  
(Federal Register Volume 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995)

*Control of Outdoor Advertising Signs* (Texas Department of Transportation, Right of Way Division, Booklet 15.647 DHT #158834, revised September, 2000), divides Texas regulations between Interstate and Primary Highways in one section and Rural Roads in a separate section. Since both of these road types might be eligible for designation as a National Scenic Byway if a state-wide program were adopted, this chapter will summarize regulations for each.

## **Interstate and Primary Highways**

The Texas Department of Transportation regulates signs located within 660 feet of the right of way of Interstate and Primary Highways which are visible from the main-traveled way of the highway. “Outside of urban areas, this control extends to include any sign located more than 660 feet from the highway right of way if the sign is visible from, and erected for the purpose of its message being seen from, the main-traveled way of the highway” (Texas Department of Transportation 2000, 7).

All signs except directional or official signs must be located in a commercial or industrial area, either zoned or unzoned. The regulations specify what constitutes zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas.

Within zoned or unzoned commercial or industrial areas sign spacing, size, and height must meet certain standards.

- Signs may not create a safety hazard.
- Signs may not be located within 1,500 feet of a public park that is adjacent to a regulated highway.
- In unincorporated areas signs may not be located within 1,000 feet of interchanges, intersections at grade, rest areas, ramps and their deceleration and acceleration lanes.
- Signs may not be located closer than 1,500 feet apart on the same side of an Interstate highway or freeway.
- Signs may not be closer than 750 feet on the same side of a nonfreeway road that is part of the primary system in unincorporated areas.
- Signs may not be closer than 300 feet on the same side of a nonfreeway road that is part of the primary system in incorporated areas.
- The spacing standards above do not apply to signs separated by buildings, natural features, or other obstructions that would allow only one sign to be visible at any time within the specified spacing.
- Signs may not be located closer than five feet of the highway right of way.
- The standards above do not apply to on-premise signs.
- Signs may not be larger than 672 square feet (maximum face height 25 feet and length 60 feet).
- Signs may not be taller than 42.5 feet.

In summary, these regulations allow a substantial number of signs in incorporated areas, with signs located less than 300 feet from each other if a building or other feature separates them in the viewshed.

On Interstate and Primary Highways in Texas rural unincorporated areas, which are the primary focus of the National Scenic Byways Program, the effectiveness of the state regulations depends on whether an area is considered to be an unzoned commercial or industrial area. If an area does not qualify as a commercial or industrial area signs may not be permitted, but if it does qualify as such an area signs may be located within 1,500 feet of each other on Interstate highways or 750 feet on nonfreeway highways. Thus, a key to the effectiveness of current state regulations to control outdoor advertising is the definition of unzoned commercial and industrial areas. TxDOT defines them as follows:

*An unzoned commercial or industrial area is an area along the highway right of way that has not been zoned under authority of law, that is not predominantly used for residential purposes, and that is within 800 feet, measured along the edge of the right of way, of, and on the same side of the highway as, the principal part of at least two adjacent recognized commercial or industrial activities. (Texas Department of Transportation 2000, 9).*

In the context of unplanned and unzoned land uses in the unincorporated portions of Texas counties, it is entirely possible that such commercial and industrial areas could occur frequently and outdoor advertising signs would be common. Thus, current state regulations do not provide the level of outdoor advertising standards or limitations found in the National Scenic Byway regulations. Of course, the national regulations would not actually prevent construction or cause removal of a new sign, but would result in de-designation of the byway. The choice between the sign or the byway would be left up to local decision.

## **Rural Roads**

The Texas Department of Transportation also regulates outdoor advertising signs on rural roads, but with a different set of standards than Interstate and Primary Highways. The TxDOT regulations define a rural road as:

*A road, street, way, highway, thoroughfare, or bridge that is located in an unincorporated area and that is not privately owned or controlled, any part of which is open to the public for vehicular traffic, and over which the*

*State or any of its political subdivisions have jurisdiction*  
(Texas Department of Transportation 2000, 52).

This definition establishes a jurisdiction that is broader than the potential jurisdiction of the National Scenic Byways Program since it includes county roads that are not eligible for participation in the National Scenic Byways Program.

The relevant standards for outdoor advertising signs on rural roads as specified by the Texas Department of Transportation (2000, 57-59) are as follows:

- All off-premise signs must be located within 800 feet of at least one adjacent recognized commercial or industrial activity or a government entity, and on the same side of the road as the activity.
- The commercial or industrial activity must be located within 200 feet of the road right of way.
- Off-premise signs must not create a traffic hazard, interfere with official signs or signals, obstruct drivers' views, or cause distractions.
- Off-premise signs with face areas larger than 301 square feet must be at least 1,500 feet from each other on the same side of the road. Likewise, signs with face areas of 100 square feet but less than 301 square feet must be at least 500 feet apart, and signs of less than 100 square feet face area must be at least 150 feet apart.
- The spacing rules above do not apply to signs located at the same intersection if they are directed to traffic flowing in different directions and if they are not visible from an Interstate or Primary highway.
- The face area of on-premise signs may not exceed 400 square feet and off-premise signs may not exceed 673 square feet.
- The maximum face area height of an off-premise sign must not exceed 25 feet and its length must not exceed 60 feet.
- Total height of rural road outdoor advertising signs must not exceed 42.5 feet.

While the standards above are relatively specific, the following exemptions may allow a proliferation of outdoor advertising signs as compared to the rigid prohibition of the National Scenic Byways Program. The following **exemptions**

are quoted directly from TxDOT's *Control of Outdoor Advertising Signs* (p. 56).

- On-premise and off-premise signs on private property that are no larger than eight (8) square feet.
- Off-premise signs on private property that are no larger than 32 square feet and show only the name of a place or activity and directions to the place or activity.
- Off-premise signs on private property which are no larger than 50 square feet, advertising the name of a small business and directions to same.
- Signs owned by a Chamber of Commerce organization which are no larger than 150 square feet, if the message is limited to public service information, does not mention any specific person, service or product, and if the sign is located within the ETJ of the city supported by the organization, or within the county in the case of a county Chamber of Commerce organization.

As with outdoor advertising signs on Interstate and Primary Highways, given the context of unplanned and unzoned land use in unincorporated areas, Texas regulations allow for the potential of a substantial number of signs on rural roads, compared to the rigid prohibition of signs on a designated National Scenic Byway.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, current Texas regulations of outdoor advertising signs do not provide the level of protection afforded by the National Scenic Byways Program. Recognizing the vulnerability of certain scenic roads to the intrusion of outdoor advertising signs, recent legislation [77(R) SB 1128] prohibits new off-premise signs and places restrictions on reconstruction or relocation of existing off-premise signs on specified road segments in the state. This legislation is stronger than the regulations of the National Scenic Byways Program because actual civil penalties are imposed in the case of violation. The only negative sanction of the National Scenic Byways Program is to de-designate the byway, thus leaving enforcement of the regulation up to unspecified local processes that may or may not be effective.

## **An alternative consideration of outdoor advertising**

Various interest groups have justifiably made a strong argument against outdoor advertising because of the deleterious effect it can have on the aesthetic quality of the landscape. This position is reflected in the prohibition of new outdoor advertising in the National Scenic Byways Program.

However, outdoor advertising is the nexus of two cross-currents that are fundamental to the National Scenic Byways Program.

On one hand, the National Scenic Byways Program sets out to protect the intrinsic qualities of the byway corridor – through the Corridor Management Plan and the prohibition of outdoor advertising. On the other hand, the National Scenic Byways Program intends to help stimulate local economic development through tourism. These two purposes are clearly related and mutually supportive in that a sustainable tourism economy based on a scenic byway depends on high quality environmental characteristics. However, the relationship between the two is more complex than is reflected in the National Scenic Byways regulations.

As described in this study, landowners bear the primary costs of the scenic attractions and the maintenance of intrinsic qualities. However, most of the benefits of tourism expenditures accrue to communities that offer hospitality and transportation services. Landowners benefit economically in only two ways. First, tourism tax revenue may reduce property taxes, but also may increase them if the demand for infrastructure and emergency services increase. Second, landowners may develop a tourism enterprise on their land. However, if they do, outdoor advertising may be crucial for the success of the enterprise. Without outdoor advertising the only means of promotion and direction would be brochures, websites, and other advertisements, which implies extra cost for the enterprise and that the potential customer must somehow connect with those materials and then find the place. This can be quite difficult in rural areas. Lack of outdoor advertising also means that the enterprise cannot benefit from impulse purchases of the travelers.

There should be a middle ground. Scenic routes should be protected from deleterious and distasteful outdoor advertising, but those serving the tourist market should be able to advertise their products and provide directions. Signage design standards have been developed that meet both of these criteria. These should be considered rather than blanket prohibitions of signs on travel routes.

**Vegetation  
Control  
Regulations**

Presently, there are no vegetation control regulations that govern Texas highway rights-of-way. However, the Maintenance Division of the Texas Department of Transportation manages vegetation to meet the following objectives:

- Provide for public safety
- Maintain the integrity of the pavement
- Provide for erosion control
- Provide for maintenance efficiency
- Provide beauty to the traveling public
- Provide habitat for small wildlife

The division achieves these objectives on established vegetation on right-of-ways by the prudent use of very selected herbicides and mowing practices. The division is conscientious not to introduce tall growing vegetation that may cause sight/distance problems. Vegetation is maintained short during the winter while most plants are dormant to reduce potential fire hazards. Control of federally listed noxious weeds, invasive species and other undesirable vegetation is a high priority throughout the state.





## Appendix 1 Grant Awards for 2002

### **FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Monday, April 22, 2002  
Contact: Lori Irving  
Telephone: 202-366-0660  
FHWA 13-02

*20 Million to Go to 38 States*

### **U.S. Transportation Secretary Mineta Marks Earth Day with Grants for Scenic Byways**

U.S. Transportation Secretary Norman Y. Mineta today celebrated Earth Day by announcing that 136 projects in 38 states will share \$20 million in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) scenic byways grants. This funding helps recognize, preserve and enhance America's scenic roads and highways throughout the United States.

"President Bush wants us to celebrate the rich blessings of our nation's natural resources and to take stock of our stewardship of nature's gifts," Secretary Mineta said. "Earth Day provides a special opportunity to appreciate the highways and byways that course through America's spectacular beauty. These funds will help ensure that America's scenic riches remain for generations to come."

The vision of the National Scenic Byways Program is "to create a distinctive collection of American Roads, their stories and special places." Today's funding is intended to help achieve the vision of the byways program by funding projects that engage volunteers to preserve and enhance these byways; demonstrate environmentally sensitive solutions to problems in preserving these byways; and enable people to walk and bike in natural settings.

National Scenic Byways Discretionary funds enable states to undertake eligible projects along highways designated as All-American Roads, National Scenic Byways and state-designated byways. Eligible under this program are planning projects to inventory, preserve and enhance the qualities of the byway, safety improvements, construction of bike and pedestrian facilities, development of visitor information such as brochures and interpretive facilities and scenic overlooks, resource protection such as scenic easements and byway marketing.

"The projects funded today highlight the importance and value of preserving our scenic vistas and important landscapes through grassroots volunteer efforts," FHWA Administrator Mary E. Peters said. "These efforts also serve as tools to boost local economies through tourism and create a sense of pride."

Besides generating a sense of pride and enthusiasm for those involved, these projects are intended to help carry on a legacy of stewardship. Over 10 years, fiscal years 1992 to 2001, the National Scenic Byways Program has provided \$157 million for 1,146 projects in 48 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

Additional information, brochures and maps can be obtained by calling 1-800-4-BYWAYS (1-800-429-9297) or by going to the national scenic byways program website, [www.byways.org](http://www.byways.org).

The following table lists the scenic byways grants for fiscal year 2002, in some cases pending application approval by FHWA.

<b>State</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Amount Funded</b>
<b>Alabama</b>	Mobile Bay Causeway*	\$250,000
	Alabama Scenic Byways*	\$750,000
	<b>Total for Alabama (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Alaska</b>	Seward Highway: Historic Resource Protection & Gold Rush Interpretive Facility	\$47,228
	Seward Highway Millennium Trail Improvements, Alaska 2002	\$350,000
	<b>Total for Alaska (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$397,228</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	Dine'tah (Among the People) Scenic Road	\$123,200
	Scenic Byways Information and Interpretive Program -- Arizona Parkways, Historic and Scenic Road Program	\$213,800
	<b>Total for Arizona (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$337,000</b>

<b>California</b>	Stovepipe Wells Sand Dunes Day Use Facilities	\$300,000
	Formation and Structure for Byway Organization--Hwy 1 along the Big Sur Coast	\$25,000
	Carson Pass Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan (CMP)	\$162,320
	Jacinto Reyes Scenic Byway CMP	\$174,640
	<b>Total for California (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$661,960</b>
<b>Colorado</b>	Tourism With Tradition: Interpreting the Cultural Qualities of Colorado Byways	\$25,100
	West Elk Loop - Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Plan	\$52,000
	Frontier Pathways - Goodnight Barn Pullout/Interpretive Planning	\$16,000
	Colorado River Headwaters Interpretive Improvement Plan	\$56,520
	State Technical Assistance Program	\$80,000
	Santa Fe Trail Corridor Management Plan (CMP) Implementation	\$25,000
	Top of the Rockies CMP Implementation - Coordination	\$25,000
	Gold Belt Tour CMP Implementation - Coordinated Marketing	\$25,000
	Grand Mesa CMP Implementation - Organizational Goals	\$25,000
	San Juan Skyway CMP Implementation	\$25,000
	San Juan Skyway - Little Molas Lake Recreation Complex	\$100,000
	Grand Mesa - Summit Trailhead Relocation	\$135,000
	Peak to Peak Education and Land Protection Project	\$71,501
	<b>Total for Colorado (13 projects)</b>	<b>\$661,121</b>
<b>Connecticut</b>	Merritt Parkway Landscape Improvements	\$814,400
	<b>Total for Connecticut (1 project)</b>	<b>\$814,400</b>
<b>Delaware</b>	Development of the Delaware State Scenic and Historic Highways Program	\$92,000
	<b>Total for Delaware (1 project)</b>	<b>\$92,000</b>
<b>Florida</b>	Implementing a Multimodal Greenway System for the Scenic Byway	\$330,000
	Implementing a Gateway System to Enhance Public Accessibility to Intrinsic Resources	\$78,000
	Re-construction of Melbourne Beach Historic Pier	\$145,346
	<b>Total for Florida (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$553,346</b>
<b>Illinois</b>	Byway Coordinator for Great River Road in Illinois	\$25,000
	Illinois Lincoln Highway - Corridor Management Grant - Year 2 Administration Funds	\$25,000
	Meeting of the Great Rivers Scenic Byway Administrative Management - Year 2	\$24,999
	Illinois National Road CMP Implementation - Byway Attraction Development	\$25,000
	Ohio River Scenic Route CMP Implementation - Year 2	\$25,000
	Cumberland County Covered Bridge Pull-off and Interpretive Site	\$222,482
	Illinois Lincoln Highway Interpretive Plan	\$92,800
	Interpretive Center for the State Pond Recreational Area	\$58,040
	Ohio River Scenic Route Recreational Area	\$374,490
	<b>Total for Illinois (9 projects)</b>	<b>\$872,811</b>
<b>Indiana</b>	Indiana National Road Administration and Professional Development: Growing the Organization	\$25,000
	Ohio River Scenic Byway CMP Implementation: Administration and Professional Development	\$25,000
	High Street Revitalization Project, Economic Development and Historic Preservation*	\$375,000
	<b>Total for Indiana (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>
<b>Iowa</b>	Corridor Management	\$25,000

	Great River Road Interpretive Center and Network of Interpretive Centers	\$737,376
	Great River Birding Trail (Iowa Maps)	\$16,000
	<b>Total for Iowa (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$778,376</b>
<b>Kansas</b>	Statewide Scenic Byway Conference 2002	\$11,200
	Development of Kansas Scenic Byway Website	\$45,557
	<b>Total for Kansas (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$56,757</b>
<b>Kentucky</b>	Corridor Management Plan	\$36,000
	Interpretation Plans	\$204,800
	Marketing Materials and Assistance	\$120,000
	Byways Facilities Grant	\$524,200
	<b>Total for Kentucky (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$885,000</b>
<b>Louisiana</b>	Hurricane Audrey Museum on the Creole Nature Trail National Scenic Byway	\$180,000
	Seed Grant for the Creole Nature Trail National Scenic Byway	\$15,000
	Louisiana Great Gulf Coast Birding Trail	\$134,400
	Toledo Bend Forest Scenic Byway: Scenic Overlook at Clyde's Crossing	\$5,040
	Toledo Bend Forest Scenic Byway: Marketing through Trade Shows and Press Kits	\$10,320
	<b>Total for Louisiana (5 projects)</b>	<b>\$344,760</b>
<b>Maine</b>	Copy of Acadia Byway CMP Implementation	\$24,000
	Old Canada Road CMP Implementation	\$25,000
	Implement Rangeley Lakes Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan - Year Two	\$25,000
	Schoodic Byway Corridor Planning and Administration	\$24,000
	Old Canada Road Gateway Turnout Planning, Design and Land Acquisition	\$228,000
	State Route 27 - Safety Improvements	\$34,400
	Schoodic Byway Gateway Scenic Turnouts	\$40,800
	Electronic Delivery of Scenic Byway Interpretive Information	\$30,720
	<b>Total for Maine (8 projects)</b>	<b>\$431,920</b>
<b>Maryland</b>	National Road Corridor Wide Interpretive Panels	\$301,440
	Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Interpretive Plan	\$42,960
	Chesapeake Country Water Access Improvements	\$102,110
	Charles Street CMP	\$80,000
	Lower Eastern Shore Scenic Byways	\$60,000
	<b>Total for Maryland (5 projects)</b>	<b>\$586,510</b>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Scenic Turnout	\$69,600
	Northfield Main Street Improvement Project	\$81,400
	Millers Falls Streetscape Project	\$349,000
	Route 6A - Old King's Highway	\$500,000
	<b>Total for Massachusetts (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Michigan</b>	Leelanau Heritage Route CMP Implementation	\$44,400
	Southeast Michigan's Main Street Marketing for Woodward Avenue - Phase III Implementation	\$536,000
	<b>Total for Michigan (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$580,400</b>

<b>Minnesota</b>	Edge of the Wilderness Scenic Byway: Seed Grant: 2002	\$25,000
	Seed Funds to Implement the North Shore CMP - Scenic Byway Component	\$25,000
	Grand Rounds Corridor Management Plan Administration--Volunteer Manager	\$24,960
	CMP Implementation - Increase Grassroots Support	\$25,000
	Integrated Byway Advertising	\$96,000
	Edge of the Wilderness Scenic Byway: Lind-Greenway Mine Interpretive Site Enhancement	\$40,000
	A Grand Journey of Learning: Historic Figures and Stories of the Grand Rounds	\$24,000
	North Shore Scenic Drive Interpretive Plan (East Segment)	\$72,800
	The Great River Birding Trail	\$25,600
	Interpretive Plan for the Paul Bunyan Scenic Byway	\$52,960
	Cass Lake Rest Area & Interpretive Center - Site Component	\$96,000
	<b>Total for Minnesota (11 projects)</b>	<b>\$507,320</b>
<b>Mississippi</b>	Travelers Information Radio System	\$7,200
	<b>Total for Mississippi (1 project)</b>	<b>\$7,200</b>
<b>Missouri</b>	Clarksville/Louisiana Natural/Industrial Interpretative Project	\$229,680
	Hopkin's Schoolhouse Renovation	\$216,136
	Rt. W/WW Cultural and Historical Byway	\$28,000
	Cliff Drive Interpretation - Phase II	\$133,485
	<b>Total for Missouri (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$607,301</b>
<b>Nebraska</b>	Nebraska Byways Facilities/Interpretation	\$220,800
	Nebraska Byways - Marketing/Interpretive	\$85,480
	Nebraska Byways CMP/Byway Marketing	\$141,600
	<b>Total for Nebraska (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$447,880</b>
<b>New Hampshire</b>	White Mountain Trail Program Development	\$25,000
	Historic Grafton County Court House (Alumni Hall) Restoration as Scenic Byway Interpretive Center	\$152,425
	Northern Forest Visitor and Interpretation Center	\$324,000
	<b>Total for New Hampshire (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$501,425</b>

<b>New Mexico</b>	Jemez Mountain Trail Comfort Station	\$23,200
	Implementation of the Jemez Mountain Trail Corridor Management Plan	\$122,900
	Turquoise Trail Interpretive Development Project	\$62,300
	Route 66 Scenic Byways Livable Communities and Transportation	\$200,000
	<b>Total for New Mexico (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$408,400</b>
<b>New York</b>	Champlain Canal Scenic Byway - "Old Saratoga" Network of Interpretive Parks	\$115,000
	Central Adirondack Trail Scenic Byway - CMP	\$110,800
	Route 90 Scenic Byway - Scenic Byway Information and Interpretation Center	\$74,500
	Black River Trail Scenic Byway - CMP	\$102,800
	Seaway Trail National Scenic Byway - Comprehensive Byways Bicycle Map and Development Plan	\$118,080
	<b>Total for New York (5 projects)</b>	<b>\$521,180</b>
<b>North Carolina</b>	Outdoor Advertising Sign Purchases - Stage 3	\$800,000
	<b>Total for North Carolina (1 project)</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>
<b>Ohio</b>	Development and Implementation of a Statewide Byway Marketing Plan	\$481,000
	Interpretive Gazebo Welcome Centers	\$200,000
	<b>Total for Ohio (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$681,000</b>
<b>Oregon</b>	Honeyman State Park Connector Trail	\$472,000
	<b>Total for Oregon (1 project)</b>	<b>\$472,000</b>
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	Kinzua Bridge Access - SR 3011	\$507,200
	<b>Total for Pennsylvania (1 project)</b>	<b>\$507,200</b>
<b>Rhode Island</b>	Development of Corridor Management Plan for Route 114 ( Hope St. & Ferry Rd.) and High St. in Bristol, RI	\$24,000
	<b>Total for Rhode Island (1 project)</b>	<b>\$24,000</b>
<b>South Carolina</b>	Ashley River Road Byway Administrator (Seed Funding)	\$25,000
	Planning for Restoration of Historic Structure as a Byway Welcome Center	\$15,000
	Seed Grant II - Expansion of "Grass Roots" Organization	\$23,280
	<b>Total for South Carolina (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$63,280</b>
<b>South Dakota</b>	Peter Norbeck National Scenic Byway: Gordon Stockade Restoration and Improvements	\$516,283
	<b>Total for South Dakota (1 project)</b>	<b>\$516,283</b>
<b>Utah</b>	Energy Loop Nat'l Scenic Byway - 25K CMP Implementation - Year	\$25,664
	Nebo Loop Nat'l Scenic Byway - 25K CMP Implementation - Year 2	\$25,000
	Provo Canyon Scenic Byway - Non-Motorized Trail Extension	\$774,022
	Energy Loop Nat'l Scenic Byway - Interpretive Signage	\$11,120
	<b>Total for Utah (4 projects)</b>	<b>\$835,806</b>
<b>Vermont</b>	Vergennes Main Street Byway Recreational Access Project - phase 1	\$157,466
	<b>Total for Vermont (1 project)</b>	<b>\$157,466</b>
<b>Washington</b>	Iron Goat Interpretive Site	\$646,500
	Sweet Creek Falls Interpretive Trail Project, Phase I	\$100,000
	Coulees and Canyons Heritage Corridor Great Birding Tour	\$60,000
	<b>Total for Washington (3 projects)</b>	<b>\$806,500</b>

<b>West Virginia</b>	Washington Heritage Trail - Seed Grant for Director's Compensation	\$20,000
	Midland Trail \$25K CMP Implementation Seed Grant	\$25,000
	Washington Heritage Trail - Official Map/Guide and Training Resource Packet	\$87,160
	West Virginia Byways and Backways Program (FY 2002)	\$104,080
	Promoting Treasures Within the Mountains II	\$19,000
	Little Kanawha Byway/Cedar Creek Road Backway: Brochure and Historic Markers	\$8,000
	Beverly Byway Center	\$204,000
	Cranberry Mountain Nature Center	\$99,432
	Mountain Waters Byway Project #1	\$28,570
	Copy of Little Kanawha Byway Rathbone Reconstruction Phase II	\$96,800
	<b>Total for West Virginia (10 projects)</b>	<b>\$692,042</b>
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Great River Road National Scenic Byway Learning Center Building	\$700,800
	Great River Birding Trail (Wisconsin Maps)	\$16,000
	<b>Total for Wisconsin (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$716,800</b>
<b>Wyoming</b>	Big Spring Scenic Backway	\$21,880
	Shell Falls Redevelopment Project--Final Design Phase	\$248,448
	<b>Total for Wyoming (2 projects)</b>	<b>\$270,328</b>

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pressroom/fhwa0213.htm>

## Appendix 2

### Designated National Scenic Byways and All-American Roads

(NSB = National Scenic Byway; AAR = All-American Road)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Alaska's Marine Hwy (NSB)	8,000+ mi.	coastal & marine	state	AK DOT
Glenn Hwy, Alaska (NSB)	135 mi.	nature	private	AK DOT
Seward Hwy, Alaska (AAR)	127 mi.	nature	NF, state park	AK DOT
Natchez Trace Parkway, Alabama (AAR)	425 mi.	history	private	NPS
Selma to Montgomery March Byway (AAR)	43 mi.	history	private	Scenic Byways Advisory Council
Talladega Scenic Dr. Alabama (NSB)	29 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Crowley's Ridge Pkwy, Arkansas (NSB)	198 mi.	history, nature	private, state	AR Delta Byways
Great River Road, Arkansas (NSB)	362 mi.	nature, culture, history	private	AR Mississippi River Parkway Commission
Kaibab Plateau-North Rim Parkway, Arizona (NSB)	42.5 mi.	nature	NP, NF	Vermillion Cliffs, BLM-AZ Strip Resource Office
Death Valley Scenic Byway, California (NSB)	81.5 mi.	nature	NP	Death Valley Nat. Park
Route 110-Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway, CA (NSB)	9.45 mi.	history	private	Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
Route 1, Big Sur Coast Highway, CA (AAR)	72 mi.	nature	NF, state park, private	Route One, Big Sur Coast Highway
Tioga Road/Big Oak Flat Rd., California (NSB)	64 mi.	nature	NP	Yosemite Nat. Park
Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway, CA (AAR)	360 mi.	nature	NF, state, private	Siskiyou County Visitors Bureau



<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Dinosaur Diamond Prehistoric Highway, CO (NSB)		nature	private, NM	Town of Fruita Tourism
Frontier Pathways Scenic & Historic Byway, CO (NSB)	103 mi.	history, nature	NF, private	Frontier Pathways Scenic & Historic Byway, Inc.
Gold Belt Tour Scenic & Historic Byway, CO (NSB)	135 mi.	history, nature	NM, state, private	Gold Belt Tour Scenic & Historic Byway
Grand Mesa Scenic & Historic Byway (NSB)	63 mi.	history, nature	NF, state, private	Grand Mesa Scenic & Historic Byway Assoc.
San Juan Skyway, CO (AAR)	233 mi.	nature, history	NF, NP, private	Office of Community Services
Santa Fe Trail Scenic & Historic Byway, CO (NSB)	184 mi.	history, nature	private, NG	Trinidad-Las Animas Co. Econ. Development, Inc.
Top of the Rockies, CO (NSB)	184 mi.	history, nature	private, NG	Top of the Rockies Byway Committee
Trail Ridge Road/Beaver Meadow Road, CO (AAR)	48 mi.	nature	NP	Rocky Mountain Nat. Park
Connecticut State Route 169, CT (NSB)	75.5 mi.	history, nature	private, state	Connecticut State Route 169 NE Council of Gov
Merritt Parkway, Connecticut (NSB)	38.3 mi.	history, nature	private	Merritt Parkway Byway
A1A Scenic & Historic Coastal Hwy, FL (NSB)	75 mi.	nature	state, private	A1A Ocean Shore CAG
Indian River Lagoon Scenic Hwy, FL (NSB)	150 mi.	nature, history	Fed., state, private	Indian River Lagoon Scenic Hwy Coalition
Tamiami Trail Scenic Highway, FL (NSB)	49.5 mi.	nature	NP, preserve, state	FL DOT
Russell-Brasstown Scenic Byway, FL (NSB)	40.6 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Great River Road, IA (NSB)	326.8 mi.	nature, history	private	Iowa-Mississippi River Parkway Commission
Loess Hills Scenic Byway, IA (NSB)	220 mi.	nature	private	Loess Hills Scenic Byway Council
Northwest Passage Scenic Byway, ID (NSB)	90 mi.	nature	Fed., Indian reservation	Clearwater Economic Development Assoc,
Payette River Scenic Byway, ID (NSB)	111.7 mi.	nature	national forest, private	Payette River Scenic Byway Advisory Council

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Pend Oreille Scenic Byway, ID (NSB)	33.4 mi.	nature	national forest, private	Hope-Clark Fork-Trestle Creek Chamber of Comm.
Great River Road, IL (AAR)	557 mi.	nature	private	Western IL Tourism Development Office
Historic National Road, IL (AAR)	165 mi.	history	private	National Road Assoc. of Illinois
Lincoln Highway, IL (NSB)	178.8 mi.	history	private	Illinois Lincoln Highway Coalition
Meeting of the Great Rivers Scenic Byway, IL (NSB)	57 mi.	nature, history	private	Meeting of the Great Rivers Scenic Byway
Ohio River Scenic Route, IL (NSB)	188 mi.	nature, history	NF, private	Main Street Golconda
Historic National Road, IN (AAR)	156 mi.	history	private	Indiana National Road Association
Ohio River Scenic Route, IN (NSB)	302 mi.	nature, history	private	Ohio River Scenic Route, Inc.
Country Music Hwy, KY (NSB)	144 mi.	history, music	private	So. & East KY Tourism Development Association
Red River Gorge Scenic Byway, KY (NSB)	46 mi.	nature	NF state parks, private	So. & East KY Tourism Development Association
Wilderness Road Heritage Hwy, KY (NSB)	93.8 mi.	nature, history	NF, state parks, private	So. & East KY Tourism Development Association
Creole Nature Trail, LA (AAR)	180 mi.	nature	private, NWR	Creole Nature Trail Nat. Scenic Byway District
Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway, MD (NSB)	85.5 mi.	birds, bay	private	Kent County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
Historic National Road, MD (AAR)	170 mi.	history	private	Maryland Planning Office
Acadia Byway, ME (AAR)	40 mi.	nature	NP, private	Acadia All-American Rd.
Old Canada Road Scenic Byway, ME (NSB)	78.2 mi.	history, nature	private	Old Canada Road Scenic Byway, Inc.
Rangeley Lakes Scenic Byway, ME (NSB)	35.6 mi.	nature	private	Rangeley Lakes Scenic Byway

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Schoodic Scenic Byway, ME (NSB)	29 mi.	nature	private	Corridor Mgmt Entity
Woodward Ave. (M-1), MI (NSB)	27 mi.	auto history	private	Woodward Heritage Team
Edge of the Wilderness, MN (NSB)	47 mi.	nature, history	NF, state	Minnesota Highway 38 Leadership Board
Great River Road – MN (NSB)	575 mi.	nature, history	private	Mississippi Parkway Commission
Historic Bluff Country Scenic Byway, MN (NSB)	88 mi.	nature	state forest, private	SE MN Historic Bluff Country, Inc.
Minnesota River Valley Scenic Byway, MN (NSB)	300 mi.	nature, history	private	MN River Valley Scenic Byway Alliance
North Shore Scenic Drive, MN (AAR)	150mi.	nature	NF, state parks	Arrowhead Regional Develop. Commission
The Grand Rounds Scenic Byway, MN (NSB)	52 mi.	nature, history	private, regional parks	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
Crowley’s Ridge Parkway, MO (NSB)	14.2 mi.	nature, history		Nat. Scenic Byways
Little Dixie Hwy of the Great River Rd, MO (NSB)	26 mi.	nature, history	private	Main St. Clarksville
Natchez Trace Parkway, MS (AAR)	444 mi.	history, nature	private	NPS
Beartooth Highway, MT (AAR)	54 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Blue Ridge Parkway, NC (AAR)	469 mi.	nature	private, NF	NPS
Cherochala Skyway, NC (NSB)	20.5 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Sheyenne River Valley Scenic Byway, ND (NSB)	63 mi.	nature	private	Sheyenne River Valley Scenic Byway Committee
Kancamagus Scenic Byway, NH (NSB)	28 mi.	nature	NF	White Mtn. Trail, NH Scenic Byways Council
White Mountain Trail, NH (NSB)	108 mi.	nature	NF	White Mtn. Trail, NH Scenic Byways Council
Billy the Kid Trail, NM (NSB)	84 mi.	history, nature	NF, private	Billy the Kid National Scenic Byway

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
El Camino Real, NM (NSB)	299 mi.	history, nature	NF, NWP, NM, private	Albuquerque Hispano Chamber of Commerce
Historic Route 66, NM (NSB)	604 mi.	history	private, NF, NM	New Mexico Route 66 Association
Jemez Mountain Trail, NM (NSB)	132 mi.	nature, history	NF, Indian	Jemez Mountain Trail Reservation Committee
Santa Fe Trail, NM (NSB)	381 mi.	history	private, NF	New Mexico Santa Fe Trail NSB Alliance
Turquoise Trail, NM (NSB)	61.2 mi.	history	private	Turquoise Trail Assoc.
Lake Tahoe Eastshore Drive, NV (NSB)	28 mi.	nature, history	NF	Tahoe Douglas Chamber of Commerce
Las Vegas Strip, NV (AAR)	4.5 mi.	culture	private	Nevada Commission on Tourism
Pyramid Lake Scenic Byway, NV (NSB)	37 mi.	nature, culture	Indian Res.	Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Offices
Lakes to Locks Passage: Country	234 mi.	nature, history	state parks,	Adirondack North
The Great NE Journey, NY (AAR)			private	Association
Seaway Trail, NY (NSB)	454 mi.	nature	private	NYS Seaway Trail, Inc.
Amish Country Byway, OH (NSB)	76 mi.	culture	private	Friends of the Amish Country Byway
CanalWay Ohio Scenic Byway, OH (NSB)	110 mi.	history	private	Ohio & Erie Canal Association
Historic National Road, OH (AAR)	228 mi.	history	private	Ohio Historic Preservation Office
Ohio River Scenic Route, OH (NSB)	462 mi.	history, nature	private, NF	Ohio River Trails, Inc.
Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway, OR (NSB)	66 mi.	nature, history	NF	USFS
Hells Canyon Scenic Byway, OR (AAR)	218 mi.	nature	private, NF	La Grande/Union County Visitor & Conven. Bureau

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Historic Columbia River Highway, OR (AAR)	70 mi. Hwy.	nature	NF, state park	Historic Columbia River Advisory Committee, OR DOT
McKenzie Pass-Santiam Pass Scenic Byway, OR (NSB)	82 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Outback Scenic Byway, OR (NSB)	171 mi.	nature	NF, private	Outback Scenic Byway Lakeview Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Coast Scenic Highway, OR (AAR)	350 mi.	nature	private, NF, Nat. Rec. Area	OR DOT
Rogue-Umpqua Scenic Byway, OR (NSB)	172 mi.	nature	NF, NP, state parks	Umpqua Nat. Forest
Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway, OR (AAR)	140 mi.	nature	NP, NF, private	Volcanic Legacy All American Road Steering Group
West Cascades Scenic Byway, OR (NSB)	220 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Historic National Road, PA (AAR)	90 mi.	history	private	National Road Heritage Park of Pennsylvania
Ashley River Road, SC (NSB)	11 mi.	history	private	Ashley River Conservation Coalition
Cherokee Foothills Scenic Hwy, SC (NSB)	112 mi.	nature, history	private	Appalachian Council of Governments
Savannah River Scenic Byway, SC (NSB)	110 mi.	nature	private, NF, state park	SC Dept. of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
Peter Norbeck Scenic Byway, SD (NSB)	68 mi.	nature	NF, state park	USFS
The Native American Scenic Byway, SD (NSB)	101 mi.	culture, history	Indian Res., NG, private	Native American Scenic Byway
Cherochala Skyway, TN (NSB)	22.5 mi.	culture, history	NF, NP	Monroe County Tourism Council
Natchez Trace Parkway, TN (AAR)	425 mi.	history	private	NPS
Dinosaur Diamond Prehistoric Hwy, UT (NSB)	512 mi.	nature, history	Indian res., NF, private	Dinosaur Diamond Inc.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Land</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Flaming Gorge – Uintas Scenic Byway, UT (NSB)	82 mi.	nature	NF, state park, private	USFS
Highway 12-A Journey Through Time Scenic Byway, UT (AAR)	122 mi.	nature	NF, NM	Scenic Byway 12 Steering Committee
Logan Canyon Scenic Byway, UT (NSB)	41 mi.	nature	NF, private	Logan Canyon Scenic Byway Corridor Team
Nebo Loop Scenic Byway, UT (NSB)	37 mi.	nature	NF	Mountainlands Assoc. of Governments
The Energy Loop: Huntington & Eccles Canyons Scenic Byway, UT (NSB)	85.9 mi.	nature, history	NF	Emery County Economic Development
Chinook Scenic Byway, WA (AAR)	85 mi.	nature	NF, NP, private	Chinook Scenic Byway
Mountains to Sound Greenway, WA (NSB)	100 mi.	nature	private	Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust
Strait of Juan de Fuca Highway – SR 112, WA (NSB)	61.1 mi.	nature, culture	private	Clallam Bay-Seki Chamber of Commerce
Great River Road, WI (NSB)	249 mi.	nature, history	private	Wisconsin Mississippi River Pkwy Commission
Highland Scenic Highway, WV (NSB)	43 mi.	nature	NF	USFS
Historic National Road, WV (AAR)	16 mi.	history	private	National Road Alliance of West Virginia
Midland Trail, WV (NSB)	116.8 mi.	nature	private	Midland Trail Scenic Byway Association
The Coal Heritage Trail, WV (NSB)	97.6 mi.	history, culture	private	Coal Heritage Trail
Washington Heritage Trail, WV (NSB)	136.7 mi.	history	private	Martinsburg-Berkeley County CNB
Beartooth Scenic Hwy. WY (AAR)	69 mi.	nature	NF, private	USFS

### **Appendix 3: Survey Results**

## Scenic Byways Survey Results

### Goals

1. What are the main goals of your byway?

economic development  
safe & efficient transportation  
promote tourism  
make region a great place to live  
preserve scenic/intrinsic qualities  
foster understanding of byway as avenue for commerce & cultural exchange  
encourage cooperation among agencies  
provide visitors with excellent byway experience  
preserve heritage  
promote education for resource protection  
bring local communities closer together  
qualify for grant money to enhance byway  
foster participation and community support

### Economic Issues

2. Has the byway stimulated business opportunities for farmers, ranchers, or other landowners along its route?

18 yes  
8 no

3. If yes to number 2, what kinds of business have developed and how successful are they?

bed and breakfast  
roadside stands  
increase in home values  
protected forestry business and recreational base  
tourism  
restaurants  
stores  
motels  
ranch tours/barbeques  
birding & bike trails  
antiques  
nature related  
working artisans  
development of ranch land into suburbs  
wineries established  
craft shops  
gift shops  
local eco-type seed collection and sales  
prairie seeders  
guest ranches  
tours



4. Has the byway stimulated business opportunities in communities along its route?

19 yes  
4 no

5. If yes to number 4, what kinds of business have developed and how successful are they?

bike  
coffee houses  
home sales  
retail business  
recreation: rafting, snowmobile, skiing  
bed & breakfast  
restaurants  
antiques  
gallery

6. Which of the following have affected private landowners?

Trespass	<u>1</u> yes	<u>19</u> no
Land use regulations	<u>3</u> yes	<u>18</u> no
Trash	<u>1</u> yes	<u>20</u> no
Other – please specify		

7. What is your impression of the effect of the byway on land values adjacent to the byway?

11 Increase  
       Decrease  
10 No change  
7 I have no way to judge

8. Have there been conflicts with other economic activities?

4 yes  
23 no

9. If yes to number 8, what have been those conflicts?

proposed garbage dump in corridor  
mining reclamation  
billboard issues  
proposed tire burning plant

## Corridor Management Plan

10. Is private land included in the Corridor Management Plan?

23 yes  
8 no

11. How wide is the byway corridor? (range of widths)

100 ft. to 15 miles

viewshed

8 feet on either side of highway

immediate roadway to several miles

1/2 mile, 1 mile, 5 miles

viewshed from 1/4 mile to several miles

1/4 to 1/2 mile

20 miles wide by 300 miles long

30 miles by 15 miles

12. Have there been conflicts regarding the Corridor Management Plan?

5 yes  
24 no

13. If yes to number 12, please describe the conflicts and whether or how they were resolved.

speed

no trucks restriction

objections to restrictions

volunteers/public confused byway with other route

conflict between two governing agencies

some areas not suitable for buses

seasonal limitations (snow and flooding)

landowners/residents fear increase in traffic

logging companies fear regulations

billboard control

14. What agency implements and enforces the Corridor Management Plan?

Byway Committee

Maine DOT

Board of Directors

Washington Heritage Trail

Special Improvement District and Clark County Land Use Plan

Cooperative

Payette River Scenic Byway Advisory Council & Idaho DOT

Local Action Committees – grass roots partnerships

New Mexico DOT

Cache Valley Tourist Council

Woodward Heritage Organization

Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments

Hancock Planning Commission

Turquoise Trail Association

New Mexico State DOT

various state and federal agencies

National Road Association of Illinois

National Road Heritage Corridor  
Hope/Clark Fork Chamber of Commerce  
various local agencies  
SE Minnesota Historic Bluff Country and Minnesota DOT  
Arkansas Delta Byways  
Mississippi River Parkway Commission of Arkansas  
New Mexico Route 66 Association  
local agencies and USFS  
Maryland National Road Association

### **Preservation/conservation**

15. Have preservation/conservation activities have been stimulated by the byway?

20 yes  
7 no

16. If yes to number 15, what have been those activities and how successful have they been?

published guidebooks  
restored old buildings & wildlife areas  
land purchase  
stewardship approach to increase awareness  
creation of trails  
local open space planning  
gateway to historic house  
identify Native American resources  
preserve environmental quality by banning cell phone towers  
develop refuge on Mississippi flyway  
generated grant funds  
3 historic national register ranches  
conservation of historic resources  
protect assets and resources along the road  
beautification through landscaping  
shoreline stabilization  
prairie restoration  
restoration of last remaining antebellum home on Mississippi River in Arkansas  
Farmland Protection Program easements  
interpretive center built

### **Evaluation Studies**

17. Have evaluation studies of the byway been conducted?

7 yes  
21 no

18. If yes to number 17, what were the general results?

awareness, or lack of, Seaway Trail  
number of visitors  
tourist dollars spent  
traffic impacts  
need for rest rooms, overlooks and pull outs

19. If yes to number 17, are those studies available? Where?

road conditions survey  
Nevada DOT and Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority  
Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments  
library in Tijeras, New Mexico

### **Speed Limits**

20. Are there any special speed limits due to byway designation?

1 yes  
30 no

21. Are there conflicts related to speed on the byway?

7 yes  
23 no

22. If yes to number 21, what are those conflicts?

heavy trucks and slow RV's  
too fast  
some slowing of traffic and increased volume  
speed  
leaf peepers/locals  
gravel roads not posted  
tourists drive too slow  
log trucks and commuters drive too fast  
conflicts between locals and tourists  
conflicts between trucks and autos  
road width too narrow for buses and farm machinery to pass

## Good Advice

### 23. What would you say to a group that was considering developing a scenic byway?

need dedicated leaders and volunteers  
estimate achievable goals  
balance resource management and economic development  
set up organization and hire staff  
don't develop byway for government dollars alone  
need committed group with a variety of interest to manage  
go for it  
local government officials to "champion" byway  
private sector should do most of work  
government/state officials to assist with legal requirements  
get funding ASAP  
don't have byway be too long  
use government agency to provide staff  
need action-oriented people – not ideological  
need to compromise  
need high-level people from all interests  
limit goals  
keep focus on positive things  
get the largest number of persons from each community involved at formulation and information stage  
hold hearings in each community  
form advisory council with representatives from each community: recommend three sub-committees –  
community management, transportation, intrinsic quality  
assemble and prioritize information and tentative plans for implementation  
use broad-based grass roots input to develop CMP  
utilize a project-oriented approach to develop public understanding of byway  
take a non-regulatory approach, i.e. stewardship  
determine if topical conflict exists with other organizations  
identify people in your highway department who understand the program  
select a consultant with a proven record of success to assist in getting program organized  
plan carefully and involve landowners along proposed byway  
plan carefully and involve landowners along proposed byway  
work behind the scenes on big issues to avoid potential conflicts  
listen-listen-listen  
talk to several other byway organizations  
to keep momentum, include short-term projects with visible results  
educate your legislative group  
start small  
build a strong grass-roots organization  
have a representative from each town along the byway  
have patience and dedication  
it's good for community involvement  
it enhances the sense of place  
it is a good tool, but won't change the byway overnight  
investigate other state and federal programs to assist in reaching goal  
limited grant resources  
limited economic value the first three years

## References

- Adams, Dennis. 2002 National Scenic Byways Program, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, Telephone interview August 7.
- America's Byways Resource Center. 2002. *National Scenic Byways Success Stories: Share the Success*. America's Byways Resource Center: Duluth, MN.
- Arizona Department of Transportation Parkways, Historic and Scenic Roads Advisory Committee. 1993. Application Procedures for Designation of Parkways Historic and Scenic Roads in Arizona. Arizona Department of Transportation, Highways Division Roadside Development Services. Phoenix, Arizona.
- Barkema, Alan D. 2000. Ag Biotech: Bold New Promise or Bold New Risk? *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. October.
- Barkema, Alan D. and Mark Drabenstott. 2000. How Rural America Sees Its Future. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. December.
- Besculides, Antonia, Martha E. Lee, and Peter J. McCormick. 2002. Residents' Perceptions of the Cultural Benefits of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 29(2):303-319.
- Bromell, T.T. 2002. Louisiana Scenic Byway Coordinator. Telephone interview, August 28, 2002
- Bryden, John M. 2002. Dynamics of Rural Areas in the EU. Paper presented at the Southern Regional Science Association, Arlington, Virginia, April 2002
- Bunce, Michael. 1998. Thirty Years of Farmland Preservation in North America: Discourses and Ideologies of a Movement. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 14(2):233-247
- Butler, R.W. 1980. The Concept of a Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *Canadian Geographer* 24: 5-12.
- Butler, Richard W. and C. Michael Hall. 1998. Conclusion: the sustainability of tourism and recreation in rural areas In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.249-258.
- Butler, Richard W. and C. Michael Hall. 1998. Image and reimagining of rural areas. In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp. 115-122.
- Campbell, Linda. 2002. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Nature Tourism Coordinator. Telephone interview, July 16.

Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University, Texas Perspectives, LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. 1999. *Historic Preservation at Work for the Texas Economy*. Austin: Texas Historical Commission.

Cox, Linda J., Morton Fox, and Richard L. Bowen. 1995. Does Tourism Destroy Agriculture? *Annals of Tourism Research* 22:210-213.

Davidson, Sharon Hurt. May/June, 2001. Branding America's Byways. *Public Roads*. <http://www.tfsrc.gov/pubrds/mayjun01/byways.htm>

Dewailley, Jean-Michel. 1998. Images of heritage in rural regions. In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.123-137.

Dilley, Robert S. 1986. Tourist Brochures and Tourist Images. *The Canadian Geographer* 30(1): 59-65.

Drabenstott, Mark and Katharine H. Sheaff. 2001. Exploring Policy Options for a New Rural America. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. June.

Drabenstott, Mark and Katharine Sheaff. 2000. Rural Policy Lessons from Abroad. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. November.

Drabenstott, Mark. 1999. Rural America in a New Century. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. October.

Drabenstott, Mark. 2000. Has Main Street Shared in the Nation's Economic Boom? *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. February.

Drabenstott, Mark. 2000. New Directions for U.S. Rural Policy. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.

Drabenstott, Mark. 2000. New Rural Policies for a New Century. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. March.

Drabenstott, Mark. 2002. Exploring Agriculture's New Frontier. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. February.

Eubanks, Ted and John R. Stoll. 1999. *Avitourism in Texas: Two studies of birders in Texas and their potential support for the proposed World Birding Center*. Austin: Fermata, Inc.

- Evans, Laurie. 2002. Scenic Byway Director. New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department. Personal interview, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Sept. 12, 2002
- Federal Highway Administration. 2002. National Scenic Byways Program Guidance for FY 2003 Grant Applications. Washington, D.C.: Federal Highway Administration.
- Garcia, Larz G. 2002. Enhancement and Scenic Roads Coordinator. Arizona Department of Transportation. Telephone interview August 22, 2002.
- Godin, Karen B. and Stephen H. Broderick. 2001. Partnering with a National Heritage Corridor: A Connecticut Case Study. *Journal of Extension*. 39(5). October.  
<http://www.joe.org/joe/2001October/a3.html>.
- Grapevine Scholars. 2002. Texas Wine Country.  
<http://www.neosoft.com/~scholars/country.htm>. Accessed 7/25/02.
- Gutierrez, Rafael, 2000. Route 66 Corridor Management Plan. Obtained from the Federal Highway Administration, National Scenic Byways Program.
- Gursoy, Dogan, Claudia Jurowski, and Musaffer Uysal. 2002. Resident Attitudes A Structural Modeling Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 79-105.
- Hall, C. Michael and Niki Macionis. 1998. Wine tourism in Australia and New Zealand In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.197-224.
- Hanka, Henry. 2002. National Scenic Byways Organization. Telephone interview. July 18.
- Hassan, Salah S. 2000. Determinants of Market Competitiveness in an Environmentally Sustainable Tourism Industry. *Journal of Travel Research* 38:239-245.
- Headrick, Janie. 2002. Texas Historical Commission, Heritage Trails Program. Personal interview. August 7.
- Henderson, Jason. 2002. The Outlook for Real Estate in Rural America. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. April.
- Hjalager, Anne-Mette. 1996. Agricultural Diversification into Tourism. *Tourism Management* 17(2):103-111.
- Hoggart, Keith and Angel Paniagua. 2001. What Rural Restructuring? *Journal of Rural Studies* 17: 41-62.
- Hopkins, Jeffrey. 1998. Commodifying the countryside: marketing myths of rurality. In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp. 139-156.



- Jenkins, John and Evi Prin. 1998. Rural landholder attitudes: the case of public recreational access to 'private' rural lands In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.179-196.
- Johnson, Jerry D. and Raymond Rasker. 1995. The Role of Economic and Quality of Life Values in Rural Business Location. *Journal of Rural Studies* 11(4):405-416.
- Johnson, Stanley. 2001. Focusing on Differences: A New Approach for Rural Policy? *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. July.
- Johnson, Thomas G. and James K. Scott. 1997. The Changing Nature of Rural Communities. Academic Papers. Community Policy Analysis Center.  
<http://www.cpac.missouri.edu/library/papers/rural-091997.html>
- Kansas Scenic Byway Program. 1999. *Visitor Survey: Economic Impact of Kansas Scenic Byway Designation on the Flint Hills Scenic Byway Communities*. Salina, KS: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.
- Kansas Scenic Byway Program. 2001. *Business Survey: Economic Impact of Kansas Scenic Byway Designation on the Flint Hills Scenic Byway Communities*. Salina, KS: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.
- Lewis, James B. 2001. Self-developed Rural Tourism: a Method of Sustainable Tourism Development. In Stephen F. McCool and R. Neil Moisey *Tourism, Recreation and Sustainability: Linking Culture and the Environment*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 177-194.
- McDaniel, Kendall. 2000. Can Scenic Amenities Offer Rural Gain Without Pain? *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. September.
- McDaniel, Kendall. 2001. Small Business in Rural America. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. May.
- McGranahan, David. 1999. Natural Amenities Drive Rural Population Change. Agricultural Economic Report NO. 781. Economic Research Service U.S. Department of Agriculture. <Http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aer781/> Accessed 6/10/2002.
- Meador, Stan. 2002. Owner/operator X-Bar Ranch and President of the Forts Trail Association. Personal interview. July 23.
- Minnesota River Valley Scenic Byway Alliance, 2001, Corridor Management Plan. Obtained from Federal Highway Administration, National Scenic Byways Program.
- Mitchell, Clare J.A. 1998. Entrepreneurialism, Commodification and Creative Destruction: a Model of Post-modern Community Development. *Journal of Rural Studies* 14(5):273-286.

Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust. 2002. Greenway Environmental Education Program. <http://www.mtsgreenway.org/EnviroEd/education/htm>. Accessed 8/16/02.

Movimento del Turismo del Vino 1995. <http://ulysses.ulysses.it/mtv/> in Hall, C. Michael and Niki Macionis. 1998. Wine tourism in Australia and New Zealand In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.197-224.

Nelson, Peter B. 2001. Rural Restructuring in the American West: Land Use, Family and Class Discourses. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 17:395-407

Newman, Cheryl. May/June, 2001. Travelers Seek Byway Experiences. *Public Roads*. <http://www.tfhr.gov/pubrds/mayjun01/bywayexperiences.htm>.

Nickerson, Norma Polovitz, Rita J. Black, and Stephen F. McCool. 2001. Agritourism: Motivations behind Farm/Ranch Business Diversification. *Journal of Travel Research*. 40:19-26.

Nilsson, Per Ake. 2002. Staying on Farms: An Ideological Background. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 7-24.

Opperman, Martin. 1996. Rural Tourism in Southern Germany. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 23(1): 86-102

Opperman, Martin. 1998. Farm tourism in New Zealand In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.225-233.

Pearce, Sally. 2002. Colorado Scenic Byway Coordinator. Telephone interview, August 27, 2002.

Pendall, Rolf, Ronald M. Wolanski, and Douglas McGovern. 2002. Property Rights in State Legislatures: Rural-Urban Differences in Support for State Anti-Takings Bills. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 18:19-33.

Peters. Gary L. 1997. *American Winescapes: The Cultural Landscapes of America's Wine Country*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Richards, Garland. 2002. Owner of Fort Chadbourne. Telephone interview. August 22.

Rylander, Carol Keeton. Feb. 2001. New Paths in Rural Texas. *Rural Texas in Transition*. <http://window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/rural/6newpaths.html>. Accessed July 1, 2002.

Saeter, Jens Aarsand. 1998. The significance of tourism and economic development in rural areas: a Norwegian case study In Butler, Richard, C. Michael Hall, and John Jenkins *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Pp.235-245.

Sheaff, Katharine. 2001. The 2000 Census and Growth Patterns in Rural America. *The Main Street Economist: Commentary on the rural economy*. Center for the Study of Rural America. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. October.

Skadberg, Andrew. 2002. Extension Specialist, Department of Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University. Telephone interview, August 7.

Smith, W.D. 2002. Oklahoma Byway Coordinator. Telephone interview, August 29, 2002.

Socher, Karl and Paul Tschurtschenthaler. 1994. Tourism and Agriculture in Alpine Regions. *The Tourist Review*. 50:35-41.

Telfer, David J. 2001. Strategic Alliances Along the Niagara Wine Route. *Tourism Management* 22: 21-30.

Telfer, David J. and Geoffrey Wall. 1996. Linkages Between Tourism and Food Production. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 23(3): 635-653.

Texas Department of Economic Development. 2001. Travel to Rural Texas. <http://research.travel.state.tx.us/tourism/special/ruralpre/RuralTexasReport.pdf>.

Texas Department of Economic Development, Tourism Division. 2002. Driving Tours. [http://www.traveltex.com/driving\\_tours.asp?SN=189661&LS=0](http://www.traveltex.com/driving_tours.asp?SN=189661&LS=0). Accessed 7/23/2002.

Texas Department of Transportation. 2000. *Control of Outdoor Advertising Signs*. Booklet 15.647, DHT #158834. Austin, Texas: Right of Way Division, Texas Department of Transportation.

Texas Economic Development. 2002. White Paper on The Effects of the 2001 Economic Downturn on the Texas Travel & Tourism Industry. Austin: Travel Research Section.

Texas Historical Commission. 2002. Texas Heritage Trails. <http://www.thc.state.tx.us/heritagetourism/http.html>. Accessed 6/21/2002.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. n.d. *Conservation Easements: A Guide for Texas Landowners*. Austin: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2002. Nature Trails in Texas. [http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/nature/tourism/nat\\_tourism\\_texas.htm](http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/nature/tourism/nat_tourism_texas.htm). Accessed 7/25/2002

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2002. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Land and Water Resources Conservation Plan Draft. Austin: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department.

Turquoise Trail All American Road Project, 2002. Corridor Management Plan. <http://www.turquoisetrail.org/aar/cmp.html>

*Vistas*, October 2001. "AASHTO Award Winners." America's Byways Resource Center. Duluth, Minnesota. pp 6-8.

*Vistas*, January 2002. “‘We Didn’t Want to Become Strip City’ The Story of the Mountains to Sound Greenway.” America’s Byways Resource Center. Duluth, Minnesota. pp. 6-7.

*Vistas*, June 2002. “You Can Make a Difference! Success Stories from the 2001 Scenic Byways Competition Winners. America’s Byways Resource Center. Duluth, Minnesota. p. 5.

Walsh, Jeffrey A., Ute Jamrozy, and Steven W. Burr. 2001. Sense of Place as a Component of Sustainable Tourism Marketing In Stephen F. McCool and R. Neil Moisey *Tourism, Recreation and Sustainability: Linking Culture and the Environment*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp.195-216.

Weston, Steve. 2002. Arkansas Byway Coordinator. Telephone interview, August 28, 2002.

Wilson, Suzanne, Daniel R. Fesenmaier, Julie Fesenmaier, and John C. van Es. 2001. Factors for Success in Rural Tourism Development. *Journal of Travel Research*. 40:132-138.

*Winnsboro News*. 2002. 5 decades of Autumn Trails history revisited. Thursday, October 3. Section.